THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

Notes of Recent Exposition.

In *The Orb and the Cross*,[1] the Rev. Alec R. Vidler, B.D., the Warden of St. Deiniol's Library, Hawarden, discusses a subject of perennial interest and importance, the relations of Church and State, a subject that includes the relation of religion and politics. This latter question does not, however, often appear as such in these pages. Mr. Vidler confines himself mainly to three questions: What is the nature of the State? What is the nature of the Church? and What is the normative idea of the right relations between them?

There was nothing in the shape of a doctrine of the State in early Christianity. The early Christians were occupied with matters that put the State into the shade. The Lord would soon return, and when the Parousia took place the State would pass out of the shade, for it would pass out of existence. There was no need for the leaders of the Early Church to concern themselves with a *doctrine* of the State. On the other hand, it was not long before these leaders were compelled to think of the matter. For the Lord did not return, and as the Parousia ceased to be imminent Christians had to acquire a more definite attitude to the Government.

In other words, they had to acquire a doctrine of the State as a guide for their conduct. And what they adopted was naturally the current classical doctrine, the political ideas of Cicero and Seneca. It was only when the Church triumphed over persecution and assumed a dominant place in the Roman Empire that the question of whether and how there could be a Christian State became actual. The need to discover the right relation between the Kingdom *not of* this world and the kingdom *of* this world became urgent, especially as the latter appeared likely to be composed largely of Christians.

The attempt to reconcile the two worlds took the form of a Church-State, a conception which engaged the minds of Christian thinkers for a long time. And as a result neither in the Middle Ages nor as a result of the Reformation was there developed a doctrine of the State separate or separable, distinct or distinguishable, from the Church. But the Church-State received its quietus, perhaps to some extent from the Reformation but mainly from the Renaissance. And its disappearance, and the emergence of a purely secular idea of the State presented a challenge to Christian thinkers to come to an understanding of the facts.

The first result of this fresh consideration was the idea of the State as a *moral* institution, with a conscience. And this brought a great deal in its train. Chiefly this, that it was the duty of the State to recognize truth and therefore to recognize religion. But surely that was only possible if the State was a personality? Well, is it? In answer Mr. Vidler plunges deep into the question: What is a person? Clearly not an individual. We are born individuals, we achieve personality. Personality is not bare and exclusive like individuality. It is inclusive. It grows by gathering many elements into itself.

Well, is there a *group* personality? It all depends on that, and on that matter Professor Ernest Barker distinguishes three attitudes to the idea. The first is the Fiction theory, according to which this idea of a group theory is a mere pretence. The second is the Collective theory according to which there is no single group-person but only a collection of individuals. And the third is that there really is a group-person, as real as an individual with a mind, a judgment, and a conscience.

The second question was, What is the Church? We need not spend time in considering the necessity of a Church or its claim to a divine origin. The point of immediate importance in connexion with its relation to the State is this: Is the Church a *visible* thing? If it is, and if the State is a moral personality, State recognition is imperative and inevitable. But the difficulty (and it is an insuperable one) is what Mr. Vidler calls 'the predicament of Christian disunity.' There

[1] S.P.C.K.; 12s. 6d. net.

is no visible Church which has a claim to recognition as the Church of God. There are all kinds of religious bodies, and all that the State can do with them is to tolerate and protect them.

And this is the most urgent reason for Church union. The State can only recognize one visible Church which can, with any show of reason, claim a divine status. But there is one way to that unity at which Mr. VIDLER only glances. He contents himself with quoting from P. T. Forsyth a very striking saying: 'The day of the sects as sects is over. The commanding Church idea returns. We look forward to an ecumenical Christianity composed not of national churches but of national types of Christianity; and within each national type a variety of cohesive and co-operant bodies, which shall be (what we are not now) at least as much concerned about their unity as about their variety.'

That might have put Mr. VIDLER on the right way, that the problem of Church union can only be solved by federation. There is no hope, and no prospect, of anything else, and this would give us Church unity and a visible Church of God with a claim of recognition as such.

But let us see, finally, what Mr. VIDLER has to say about the third question, the true relations of Church and State. A *separation* or divorce of Church from State may, the author says, in some cases be inevitable, but in the long run it spells evil for both. A Church which is not a national Church, or which is not becoming a national Church, is apt to sink into a sect, if it is not one already. And further, the recognition of the Church's inherent authority as the bearer of the everlasting, saving, and universal gospel of God, can alone afford the State a sure foundation.

The true relations of State and Church are put by Mr. VIDLER concisely. State and Church are separate and distinct forms of human society, complementary and necessary to one another. The object of the State is to secure order and justice, of the Church to proclaim truth and embody love, or more picturesquely by Dr. P. T. Forsyth: 'Both (Church and State) are divine agents for human perfection. But the one by way of law and its evolution, the other by way of conscience and its redemption. . . . The State exists to secure the conditions of goodness, the Church to create the thing itself. The State is an agent of the Kingdom of God, the Church is the Kingdom of God in the making.'

This ideal relationship has never been realized in history. The secularization of society and the disintegrated state of the Church are prohibiting conditions to-day. The collectivist State, or the planned society, of the future will probably be based on some secular doctrine of the State. And the question arises whether the Christian Faith can be so represented to the State and so recover its hold on the community as to lead to the public acknowledgment of its truth, and so to a new form of marriage between the visible Church and the State. But there are no final solutions. We have not here an abiding city. We seek one to come.

The Rev. E. L. ALLEN, M.A., Ph.D., Lecturer in Theology in the University of Durham, has published a good book for our times—*The Structure of Life*.[1] It is a thoughtful, scholarly, and attractive study of the Christian ethic and the contemporary situation. Quite a number of books of similar compass have recently appeared on the self-same subject, but we know of none that deals so ably with the contemporary situation in the light of the opinions of contemporary thinkers, both English and European.

The argument is that the fundamental principles of the Christian ethic can be confidently reaffirmed in face of the complexities of the time, but only as those principles are first restated in terms of these complexities.

At the outset the position is defended that we can still maintain, in Emerson's phrase, 'the sovereignty of ethics.' Then follow brief accounts of the sources and historical development of the Christian ethic. After that the types of Christian action are dealt with (Catholic, Protestant, Sectarian), and the two basic factors of principle and circumstance that enter into Christian action (as into ethical action generally). The way is thus prepared for the more topical part of the volume, in which particular problems are discussed; these are comprised within the headings of the Family, the Structure of Society, Freedom, and Community.

But there are two chapters dealing with intermediate questions of principle. One treats of the concept of natural law (in which there has been a renewed interest at the present day). The other treats of the relation between the material and spiritual aspects of human life. It is the substance of the latter chapter we now proceed to state in summary.

[1] Nisbet; 8s. 6d. net.

Dr. ALLEN appears to be right in saying that the contemporary situation calls for a fresh approach to this old problem. The relation between matter and spirit is a question still confronting the philosopher, the psychologist, the moralist, and the economist. Here the discussion is restricted to the sphere of social ethics, with special reference to cultural activities.

To the Hebrew mind the material and the spiritual, body and soul, are not opposed to each other but virtually identified. The social background of the conception is a phase of development in which man is still in intimate touch with Nature, and the individual not yet differentiated from the common life of his group. None the less, there is a message here for times in which there is deep concern for the welfare of the community.

To the Greek mind, as seen in Plato, matter and spirit are sharply distinguishable, the body being merely the temporary abode of the soul. The social background of the conception is a phase of development in which the environment is that of the city, rather than Nature, and one in which the individual does not feel himself to be indissolubly bound up with the community.

In a sense it is the Greek view that reasserts itself in the beginning of modern culture, after the synthesis of Hebraism and Hellenism effected by the Middle Ages has begun to break down. In the Cartesian dualism the material and spiritual aspects of life and the world are again sharply distinguished. The essence of matter is declared to be extension, the essence of spirit or mind to be consciousness, the activity of thinking.

This despiritualization of the material world, which was opposed to the principles of Hebrew thought, had the effect of loosening religion from its material and economic setting. The churches tended to become breeding grounds of sentimentalism—the charity which is in word only and not in deed; the 'symbolic' morality of which Berdyaev speaks, which does not understand spiritual life as involving the transformation of the physical existence. And the social background of this, affirms our writer, was provided by capitalism, with its characteristic separation between the functions of capital and labour.

Marxism can be understood in the light of the tendencies appearing in the Cartesian philosophy. In opposition to the dualism that separated spirit and matter, it proclaims the sovereignty of matter and the dependence of spirit. Man is once more thought of, as in the Old Testament, as bound up with his environment, though this is urban rather than natural, and with his community, though this is now his class. For here the social background is the rise to power of the proletariat.

There is in this 'revolt of the masses' a salutary lesson for religion. The conditions under which a man earns his daily bread are the most powerful influence upon his life. A demand is therefore upon us for the reuniting of body and soul, matter and spirit. No longer should we be content with a 'disembodied' Christianity having no real concern with human interests.

Is there any guidance here in the conception of incarnation, the Word made flesh, the Logos entering history as a human individual? Does it not adumbrate the hope of a sacramental society in which the material world will be penetrated and transfigured by the spiritual life, in which the activities by which men earn their living will become significant of the spiritual realities in which ultimately they live? 'In man also, yes, and even in the machine, the Word is made flesh to dwell among us.'

In line with the above are the words that follow; they occur almost at the very end of the book: 'We live to-day between the temporal restraints and the eternal truths, turning now to these and now to those. But there is a point at which the two meet and become one; it is the dwelling-place of God and, while it is always far beyond us, a step nearer to it is always within our power.'

Reconciliation and Reality.

IV. Reconciliation between the Generations: 2. The Problem at Large.

By W. Fraser Mitchell, Professor of Education in the Selly Oak Colleges, Birmingham.

Never before, so far as we can discover, has such a gulf separated the generations. The phenomenon which has been described as 'the Revolt of German Youth,' and which, according to Lord Halifax in *The Challenge to Liberty*—the published version of his address given in 1940, as Chancellor, to Oxford University—had led to a war 'between youth and youth,' is only a startling example of what is taking place elsewhere. This is notable in our own country, where what virtually amounts to a state of perpetual belligerency exists between children and adolescents, on the one hand, and their parents, teachers, and employers, on the other, and where a well-marked and growing antipathy is discernible on the part of the young and the middle-aged for the definitely aged. 'The divergences between age and youth,' Lord Halifax dismissed with something less than his customary insight, as representing 'an inevitable difference of perspective' which is both natural and healthy. But the contemporary divergences between Youth and Age go much farther. They constitute a hiatus in the body social which calls for the most drastic and speedy remedy.

This state of affairs being obviously a disease it will be well to inquire its symptoms and look into its origins. The most frequent of the symptoms is the disinclination of children to be supervised and assisted by adults or to follow suggestions made by adults for their behaviour or instruction. Every year teaching in the Day Schools becomes more difficult, even where enlightened methods are employed by teachers familiar with modern psychological knowledge. There is a marked determination on the part of children to have things their own way, to decide what activities they shall take part in, how much work they shall do, what sort of discipline shall prevail in class or school, and to follow standards of behaviour of their own devising in their relations to home and the community at large, at times in open defiance of all that teachers have endeavoured to effect. Adolescents become progressively self-assertive, and, as a means of securing non-intervention from adults, show great unreadiness to co-operate with the latter, preferring to form young people's associations of one kind or another by themselves. Not unnaturally, those now middle-aged whose lives have followed this pattern find themselves completely isolated from older people, while, apparently, the rising generation find them no more acceptable than the middle-aged find the old.

To what are we to attribute this social disintegration which is taking place before our eyes? It is not confined to one country but has manifested itself prominently in both Germany and Great Britain. Even if we omit from consideration countries where Youth Movements and incomplete harmony between the generations have been either deliberately fomented or have resulted from what may well prove to be a world-wide *malaise*, the roots of the trouble must finally be looked for in some widespread sociological condition bound up with a dominant philosophy of life. While this is so, and we shall return to examine it presently, immediate causes undoubtedly lie to hand, whose connexion with the ultimate origins of the cleavage are quite unrecognized by those whom they concern, but which follow in a long sequence from false premises everywhere adopted, and are in themselves productive of evil.

It is almost impossible to deal with this hitherto little explored subject without adopting what may easily be regarded as a controversial attitude. Yet, if we are to face squarely this important issue, we must be prepared to criticize adversely what may well seem of great value to many whose only desire is to serve Christ and do good to their fellows, especially to the young. If the present writer is astray in his diagnosis his error is his own. No editorial or other support must be inferred for his views. But if the topic is to be handled usefully it must be handled with frankness.

The first evil from which arises the failure to establish sound relations between children and parents follows from a widely-diffused, inaccurately-expressed, incompletely-understood popularization of the findings of modern psychology, for which the press, the casual lecturer, and the harassed but well-intentioned teacher must share the blame. It is a commonplace nowadays for parents to say that they have been told by Nursery School teachers that they must not check or restrain their infants. In this way, Psychology, which in the hands of the expert or the carefully

guided parent and teacher, might deliver the young child from a world of fears and inhibitions into a liberty based on a sound discipline, has become a kind of bogey to prevent parents fulfilling their first duties to their offspring.

If in Britain we turn from Day School to Church and Sunday School and follow the career of the growing child we are met by several disconcerting practices, which originating in the desire of adults to assist children, and helpful within limits as they have been, are in their general tendency disruptive of corporate life in Church and Society. Foremost among these must be mentioned the habit of removing children from the church service at an agreed point—usually after a children's address has been given—so that they may engage in activities and be taught in a lively and cheerful manner by special teachers. This practice is indefensible for a number of reasons. It is characteristic of certain denominations and is frowned upon by others, and so is likely to militate against the unity of Christ's Church. It relegates training in churchmanship and corporate worship to a late period in childhood, when it is hoped the older child may return and take part in what is to him an entirely unfamiliar service. It replaces training in worship along with adults by a pre-occupation with childish things in a special setting, reminiscent of good Infant and Day School life. In contradistinction certain denominations have special children's services, at which the customary routine of ritual is explained, and where children learn to combine in the familiar acts of worship. The object of such services is to fit children for a speedy incorporation with their elders in the ordinary services.

Of all evils resulting from the removal of children from the customary services the greatest is that literally thousands of children in England and Scotland are growing up without any familiarity with the Communion Service. The excellent old Scots habit of children ' watching ' the Communion service from a gallery did much to arouse in the young the desire to grow up and take their place alongside their parents at the Lord's Table. Wise indeed was the minister, as some whom readers may recall with affection, who spoke a word to these watching children from that Table, linking what was being done with the supper in the Upper Room, tracing the ' apostolic succession ' from Jesus and the Twelve to the children's parents, and adding : ' Presently you will be sitting here with us and doing what we are now doing.' Is it any wonder that adolescents show a reluctance to come forward to join the Church when they are unfamiliar with her central rite ? Would it not be wisdom, if not charity even, in churches where children usually go out for their own activities for them to remain or return to witness their parents' communicating ?

On the further issue of its being hard for children to sit out the normal sermon, either on the ground of its length (fifteen minutes ?) or of difficulties of comprehension, children are nothing loath to listen-in to broadcast talks of equal or greater length and on topics often well beyond their immediate comprehension. Moreover, the age varies at which different children begin to ' follow ' sermons. What is certain is that children who are unaccustomed to try to follow sermons will not be likely to make the effort in later years. It is nothing less than gross disrespect for the Word of God as set forth in Word and Sacrament to deny children their part in these, and the result is what we should expect : our children do not hold us in respect and affection ; they do not become incorporated with us into the Body of Christ ; they are content with the company and conversation of other children and adolescents—the predominant curse of all residential schools from the exclusive to the ' Approved ' ; and so the generations fall apart where they should most be united—in God's House.

In this connexion much is to be said for Principal Hamilton's plea, as set out in *The Family Church*, that where children's parents do not bring them to the services, church members should ' adopt ' as it were particular children who should sit with them in their pews, and for whose gradual training in church-going they should make themselves responsible. This plan can only succeed if the children we adopt do sit with us in the pews and are not banished after a time to what is virtually a religious ' play-room.'

In the so-called ' secular ' sphere in many countries other causes divide the generations. Often the more enterprising type of school is the worst offender. Extra-curricular activities are multiplied in the interests of the pupils. Clubs, societies, and later, old boys' and girls' associations, tend to foster cultural and other interests and to keep alive loyalty to the school. Assisting with such activities involves great sacrifice of time and labour on the part of school staffs. And to what end ? That children and their often shy, rather poorly-educated parents come to live in two distinct worlds ; that tired, overworked mothers must go on with a back-breaking round of domestic duties, while their daughters shine as tennis stars or take their place in play or orchestra. Even allowing for a certain exaggeration of emphasis in what Stovin has written in *Totem : The Exploitation of Youth*, his exposure of the undesirable, irrational, mass-appeals that are the stock-in-trade of many reputable societies for the ' benefit ' of Youth should warn us that something artificial is

being manufactured. In Britain Youth is not deliberately 'exploited' by Youth Leaders for the latter's benefit, or out of *malice prepense*. It is exploited by being occupied in activities and made responsive to appeals which are not ultimately satisfying and which cannot produce sane personalities, upon which community, as a special variety of communion, depends. Fellowship, the ultimate goal of the saints, is reduced to a yell, a series of slogans, a standardization of habits and thought and behaviour; fresh loyalties are continually being built up, and each such loyalty represents a rift in the body social.

It is no more wrong temporarily to separate children or young people for particular activities than it is to establish classes for the study of French or workshops for the practice of the manual arts. But it is wrong to allow the separate world so created (and for an ultimately social purpose) to bulk so large in the interest of the young that it appears to them the most real portion of life, as it would be wrong to permit a special piece of study or skill to absorb a pupil's attention to the exclusion of everything else. The aim behind every piece of 'separate' effort must be to restore those taking part in it, or to link them, to a larger world for which their special interest has fitted them better. Similarly the Christian is to be separated from the world in order that he may also go into the world and change its temper. The child should go to school in order that he may become a more intelligent and sympathetic member of his home circle. Young people should attend Youth Clubs not to have 'a good time' for themselves but that they may become better able to combine with men and women of all ages in active citizenship, or in, what is still more important, sheer neighbourliness.

To admit as much is to revert to the fundamental issue. We are persons, or at least we are born with the capacity of developing personality; and only persons can unite so as to make Society possible. It is to the denial of personality, whether implicit, as is frequent in modern industry, or explicit, as it became under National Socialism, that the ultimate cause of the present disintegration is to be traced. This denial transcends barriers of nationality, and such incidentals as we have noted in our own and other countries, although themselves proximate causes, derive from a common origin in the Idealistic philosophy of the nineteenth century. In its Continental form this philosophy compelled men to recognize their phenomenalism over against Reality. In its English form, as exemplified by Bosanquet's Gifford Lectures for 1911—on *The Principle of Individuality and Value*—it brought into prominence an 'absorbent' or 'focal' theory of personality, according to which individuals became more fully personal in proportion as they appropriated Reality, of which they were regarded as 'foci.' Continental Youth, therefore, especially after Scientific Materialism and Freudian Psychology had disintegrated Idealism, could regard itself as merely a collection of cyphers in an equation to whose ultimate meaning individuals contribute, but which is itself more important than they. English Youth could acquire an increasing degree of reality by increasing the individual's range of experience; but this could not end in the production of enduring personalities, but only in a number of 'foci' of a Reality which was for ever transcendent.

Obviously such philosophies cannot give the young an intelligible account of their status in the universe or assist them to mutually helpful relations with others. Hence, for both Continental and English Youth life ends in a similar futility, and in an atomism which obliges individuals to try and combine anyhow, in an attempt to keep up their courage. Massed bands, spectacles in Wembley Stadium or at the Albert Hall, Aldershot (or other) Tatoos, Super Cinemas—whatever is productive of 'mass ecstasy' is eagerly grasped at. 'Everybody's doing it. . . .' but they do not know what they are doing except that they are trying desperately to achieve 'togetherness.'

Historically, as Niebuhr has shown, in *The Nature and Destiny of Man*, the present situation results from the revolt of individuals at the time of the Reformation against a system which had ceased to allow for adequate personal responsibility. But presently, having forgotten the deep religious reasons for which he had asserted his individuality, man lost his sense of his relation to his fellows as members of Society. He invented the dream of isolated, 'natural' man, entering into a Social Contract, and the 'bourgeois individual' developed. In the high noon of evolutionary theory, and later of Vitalism, such individuals were held in repute; but they have left a terrible aftermath in the characterless masses whom they employed and led, but whom they left without any sense of social cohesion other than might be signified by the pay-book or the strike ballot. These were the 'hollow men,' but their descendants are 'stuffed men,' in whom selfishness takes the place of the true self, which can only be realized as individuals acknowledge their dependence on God and recognise their fellows as being other similarly dependent beings.

The horrors of which St. Paul warned Timothy (2 Ti 3^{1-5}) are upon us. Men have become 'lovers of their own selves, covetous, boasters, proud, blasphemers, disobedient to parents, unthankful, unholy, without natural affection, truce-breakers,

false accusers, incontinent, fierce, despisers of those that are good.'

The war of 1939–45 has shown us how such men behave on a grand scale. Our uneasy social relationships at home remind us that the situation is not necessarily improved by the defeat of large groups of such men, more particularly if we continue to manufacture them. What, then, are we to do? It is curious to reflect how a condition of affairs which can never have been common among Jews, among whom kindly relations have always existed between old and young, has been indicated by Malachi ($4^{5.6}$), who speaking of the coming 'Elijah,' prophesied that he should 'turn the heart of the fathers to the children, and the heart of the children to their fathers,' lest God 'come and smite the earth with a curse.'

Surely as Christians we must labour to effect the reconciliation, failure to achieve which carries so terrible a warning. And in Christ alone can this reconciliation be brought about. We must educate children for life with their parents and grandparents and with the other persons of their family circle, as indeed the French *écoles sans Dieu* have been doing for over seventy years as a part of their Moral Training. (And we must not banish the grandparents to special phalansteries so that contacts with them shall be exceptional and not normal.) We must endeavour to combine young people with older in all sorts of social groups, so that they may learn to understand and respect one another, and so become incorporated in Society. We want co-education not only as between the sexes but as between different age-groups. We must make certain that parts are made aware of the whole and are finally brought together to form wholes; that separation is utilized to prepare for fuller co-operation and does not end in segregation. Above all, we must strive to make individuals aware that to enjoy full personality they must recognize and acknowledge the sovereignty of God, and the demands of Christ, and must enter into loving, sympathetic relations with other people. There is 'a glue of the Spirit,' Lancelot Andrewes reminds us; it is only with the help of God's Spirit that men can stick together. Only as we live in that Spirit shall we find fellowship with others. What is required is not so much a readiness to forgive one another, when exceptional circumstances arise, as to accept one another, to care for others, and, especially as St. Paul is at pains to show, for those in our own households. Is not this the meaning of the injunction that we should *wash one another's feet*, which we do well to remind ourselves, had we possessed only the Fourth Gospel, would have been the central ceremony of the Christian Church?

Literature.

A THEOLOGIAN AS PREACHER.

THE Dean of St. Paul's, Dr. W. R. Matthews, has put many, within and beyond his own Communion, greatly in his debt by his contributions to theological literature. There is now a new gift from his pen to which his readers will turn with interest and welcome. Under the title of *Strangers and Pilgrims* (Nisbet; 8s. 6d. net) he has published a selection of sermons preached by him (mainly at St. Paul's) during the period 1941–45.

These sermons—seventeen in number—were of necessity addresses for the occasion; but they were much more. In the words of the Preface 'they attempt to deal with large themes of Christian belief and to apply them to the condition of the world.' The large themes remain the central concern: Man in his unrest and yearning; God's majesty and mercy in His revelation; Humanism's need of the Gospel; The Holy Spirit as ministry of cleansing and comfort for Church and Society; The unity of the Church and the inspiration of her martyrs; Personal religion as pardon and power in the love of God; Eternal horizons in the hope of faith. These headings are not the sermon titles but they are pointers to a large part of the content in this preaching. Throughout we are kept near the field of doctrine. It is Dr. Matthews' opinion that the traditional phrases and concepts of theology have 'become almost unmeaning' to the minds of the majority to-day. And this for him determines the direction and task of the ministry. When we penetrate beneath the surface and refuse to be stayed by merely logical difficulties we shall find in the doctrines of the Church 'an interpretation of life which has permanent value.'

These sermons are not easy reading but they will repay the attentive reader. They give us the fruit of a balanced mind exploring with appreciative concern the Christian treasure of idea and vision. The style is lucid and virile, unadorned but pungent. It is likely enough that for some readers these sermons will appear too intellectual and 'high brow.' Dr. Matthews, indeed, was aware of this possibility when he preached them, but as he did not apologize for it neither will the reviewer! There will be found in his expositions a great variety of mood and manner as well as of theme. At times the cool detachment of the author will suggest a kinship between him and his famous predecessor Bishop Butler; then again in the sharp urgency of appeal the reminiscence

will be of Robertson of Brighton. But however we classify it, we have in this book a sample of preaching for the times that is learned, assuring, and challenging. It summons men to perceive in Christ the rightful Lord of the world, and with the consent of all their faculties to rejoice in that.

J. MACLEOD.

JUDAICA.

We have received two recent volumes from the Jewish Publication Society of America, *The American Jewish Year Book 5706 :* 1945–46, vol. 47, edited by Harry Schneiderman and Julius B. Maller ($3.00), and *The Rise of the Jewish Community of New York, 1654–1860,* by Hyman B. Grinstein ($3.00). The former includes an interesting statement of the Jewish attitude to the Palestine question, marked at once by its moderate language and obviously strong feeling.

All readers of THE EXPOSITORY TIMES, Jewish or Christian, will give a warm welcome to Part 3 of the Chief Rabbi's edition of the Jewish Prayer Book—*The Authorised Daily Prayer Book with Commentary* (National Council for Jewish Religious Education). It is marked by the admirable features which have characterized the two earlier volumes, fine scholarship, skilled exposition of points that are not at once obvious, and deep religious feeling. If possible, this is even more interesting than its predecessors, for it deals with a number of special services, including those appointed for the great Festivals and those designed for use on particular occasions—marriage, circumcision, and the like. Here Dr. Hertz has given us disquisitions on the meaning of the days and seasons for which the special prayers and services are provided, and it is, perhaps, in these that the general reader will find the most valuable part of the work. They help us to understand the undying elements in the Jewish faith which have kept it and its people alive through the centuries in spite of every threat to their existence. The English translations are of that high quality which we have learnt to expect from the distinguished author, though the reader who is not familiar with the Ashkenazi pronunciation will often have to turn to the Hebrew text to appreciate transliterated technical terms. Dr. Hertz is to be congratulated on the successful conclusion of a fine piece of work which deserves the gratitude, not only of the Jewish community, but also of all those who are interested in Christian liturgical forms.[1]

T. H. ROBINSON.

ANCESTRY OF THE HARKLEAN N.T.

Most Introductions to New Testament textual criticism, when they deal with what they relegate to the fringes of the subject, tend to pass over large areas with a few general sentences. One of these areas is the post-Peshitta Syriac Versions, and in *The Ancestry of the Harklean New Testament* (Oxford University Press [for the British Academy, Supplemental Papers No. VII] ; 12s. 6d. net) Günther Zuntz has made a valuable contribution to the accurate mapping of the ground. After an introduction, which is a model both for style and clarity, the author takes up a discussion of various colophons. Colophons are a notorious breeding-ground for problems in connexion with the history of ancient literature, but the Harklean colophons are here analysed with no little skill and with a wealth of corroborative detail which shows how they shed light on the ancestry of our extant Harklean MSS. Following the rejection of the facile theory that the Harklean is only a copy of the Philoxenian Version with marginal variants, illustrations are used to prove that the Philoxenian is different from the Harklean but is closer to it than to the Peshitta. The dependence of the two later Versions on the activities of Syriac grammarians who owed their traditions to Greek scholars of Caesarea and Alexandria, is then indicated ; and it is shown that the underlying Greek which was in the hands of Thomas of Harkel, was different from that used for the making of the Philoxenian version a century before. After discussing the relation of the work of 'Euthalius' and Pamphilus to his subject the author turns to a long discussion of colometry and stichometry. He demolishes the foundations of much of the mythology which has grown up around the latter term during the past half century but leaves the impression that his results deserve elaboration in a separate treatise. He also touches on the New Testament Lectionaries and the grammatical and reference systems of the early scholars—matters where our knowledge is still in its infancy. The material adduced by the writer does not appear to us to prove a definite relationship between the Philoxenian version and the 'Caesarean' text tradition, but data are given which may well strengthen the general conclusions of Streeter and his successors, and there may yet come to light the information which would establish the Philoxenian as the link between Caesarea and the Armenian and Georgian Versions. The writer's constant call for reliable editions of the Versions, and patristic evidence which underlie his work, prompts the general reflection that, with the cessation of hostilities, a similar treatment should be accorded to the Greek New Testament manuscripts before further volumes of the Oxford New Testament go to press. This paper will have a small public but it will repay a close study by all those who feel that the literary history of the New Testament is suffering from an over-emphasis on the one-sided approach which lies by way of the classical and the occidental.

IAN A. MOIR.

The Dean of Durham (Dr. C. A. Alington) has a remarkable gift of easy and clear exposition. His books of popular apologetic were excellent, well-informed and persuasive. In his latest book, *Good News* (Blackwell ; 7s. 6d. net), he sets out

[1] This review was written before the death of Dr. Hertz. An appreciation of his work will appear later. *Editor.*

to do two things. First, to show how we should present the ' good news of God ' to our generation, and, secondly, how important it is to present, both individually and as a Church, an actual demonstration of how the gospel works in life. The former aim is carried out by an exposition of the essential truths of the gospel, notably the love of the Father. The second gives the author an opportunity of an admirably pointed statement of the Christian ethic. The Dean probably underestimates the extent to which his own exposition of the gospel is actually in practice throughout the Church. But his restatement can do nothing but good and his emphasis on ' faith by works ' is always needed. A very good book.

The Night is Ending is the title of a volume of short sermons by the Rev. Norman N. G. Cope which has just been issued by the Epworth Press (5s. net). The sermons were preached to a South London Methodist congregation during the worst periods of the raids. Against the dark background of the war Mr. Cope, out of his deep conviction, reminds his hearers of the eternal verities. We have given one of these sermons, in shortened form, in ' The Christian Year ' this month.

It is difficult to review a book like *The Scripture Lessons : a Handbook to Agreed Syllabi*, edited by Mr. J. W. Harmer, M.A. (Inter-Varsity Fellowship ; 12s. 6d. net). Presumably it is issued as a counterblast to the ' Handbooks ' from Oxford and Cambridge which are modern in their attitude. What can be said in praise of the book is that it contains the results of real work and that in many ways its advice to the young teacher is helpful. It is well planned and gives background knowledge as well as hints on particular lessons. Its main defect is its general attitude to the Bible. This necessitates the literal acceptance and defence of many things which (one would hope) few enlightened Christians could so accept. Biblical ' difficulties ' are met by an apologia which is positively antique. The worst examples are the treatment of Elisha and the bears and the divine command to slaughter the Canaanites, men, women, and children. But the same view is to be seen all through the book.

We are always glad to have a fresh mind looking at the Gospels, and Professor H. H. Rowley's brief statement of the teaching of our Lord is welcome—*An Outline of the Teaching of Jesus* (Lutterworth Press ; 1s. 6d. net). The book was written for a friend and is published because of its wider interest. Naturally, some things are omitted from such a brief survey, but what is given us is very well worth having. The book starts with the reliability of the Gospels and then goes on to such topics as the Kingdom of God, the Character of God, the Son of Man, the Call of Christ, the Meaning of Faith, the Essence of Religion, Christ's Teaching about Himself, the Suffering Servant, and the Eschatological Element. Professor Rowley has looked at the Gospels with his own eyes, and there is a freshness and originality about much of his book which makes it both attractive and enlightening.

The New Age.

By the Reverend T. Glyn Thomas, M.A., Wrexham, N. Wales.

Professor Whitehead, writing of the unbroken tradition of Western culture from Plato to 1900, says, ' It is warped by the vicious assumption that each generation will substantially live amid the conditions governing the lives of its fathers, and will transmit these conditions to mould with equal force the lives of its children. . . . We are living in the first period of history for which this assumption is false.' [1]

There is on all sides a feeling that the end of the last century was the end of an epoch and everywhere a sense of new beginnings. That the external conditions of life have changed vastly is evident to the most superficial observer. ' To-day the external conditions of life in civilized communities differ more from those of 1829 than the conditions of 1829 from those of Noah's flood,' writes Professor Haldane.[2]

But it is evident too that modern youth is refusing to take the world as it is and is bent on reshaping it. There is, first of all, a determined and ruthless break with tradition, and a fervent desire to turn our backs on the past and fix all our hopes on the future. The popularity of books on the ' future of ' this and that, and the scepticism as to all conclusions hitherto arrived at, are both witness of this.[3]

[1] Quoted by Professor W. G. De Burgh in *The Hibbert Journal*, April 1934.

[2] Quoted by Maurice Reckitt in *Christianity and the Crisis*.

[3] See *A Guide to Modern Thought*, by C. E. M. Joad, and compare the story told by Sir Reginald Blomfield in *Modernismus* of the lady student in an important school of art who showed to her teacher a fragment of a stone. The teacher was enthusiastic and implored her not to add another stroke to her beautiful work.

Besides the abrupt break with tradition and with the past, there is also a desire to do away with the supernatural and to make man the measure of all things. 'We are entering upon that new stage of evolution, the era of conscious control. We are now responsible for our own destiny. Given time we will make ourselves perfect.'[1] The same author claims that the decision on which the future of civilization rests lies in the choice between these two views, namely, whether we can still hold to a 'supernatural' faith, 'to the old belief in a transcendent God, unchanging and unconditioned in perfection, the inexhaustible giver of all good,' or whether we must put all our faith in this life and the temporal emergent process in what is changing and developing and so, in the end, perishable.[2]

This breaking away from tradition, the past, and the supernatural has left our modern world without any definite trend or universally accepted principles of thought and action, and it is in this incoherence of modern thought and knowledge that some of our most eminent thinkers find the essence of the present crisis.[3] 'Every civilization in the past has been built upon some common world view, some attitude to life and its significance. Civilization to-day has no world view. About eternal things it suspends judgment,' writes F. R. Barry.[4]

The first Great War, while it served to accentuate most of these features of our New Age, modified some of them, as we shall see later, in certain respects.

To sum up, then, we find that the main features of the new epoch, whose beginning coincides roughly with the dawn of the twentieth century, are a break with the past and its traditions, a disbelief in the supernatural, a mistrust of all previous assumptions and conclusions, which have resulted in our fixing all our hopes and interests in the future, making man the measure of all things, yielding wholeheartedly to the lure of the novel, so that what is new is seldom condemned and what is old as seldom approved, and lastly, and most momentous of all, that our civilization is left with no world-outlook or universally accepted principles of thought and action.

The Moral Chaos. The most dangerous of the offspring of the features we have mentioned, and the one which first demands our attention, is the great moral chaos in which we find ourselves. This is a phase of modern Western civilization which has for many years now been anxiously pondered over by some of our most responsible thinkers and which must press itself upon the mind and conscience of every serious observer of the signs of the times. Because it is evident that it is not just this or that opinion or body of doctrine that is being questioned, but that morality itself and even religion are on trial. 'Whereas man was once held responsible before the bar of morality,' says Rudolf Eucken,[5] 'now morality has to justify itself before man; the old-time judge now stands in the dock.' Such eminent philosophers as Professor A. E. Taylor view the situation with similar alarm,[6] and Dr. R. J. Campbell writes, 'It is not only as a body of doctrine that Christianity is being challenged but as a way of life.'[7]

So completely have we broken with the past that there appears to be nowhere any accepted code of right and wrong, a state of things which has not existed previously in modern civilization.[8] It would appear, therefore, that morality has been relegated to a department of its own, a field for the study of specialists like any special branch of science, and that we must make our personal preferences and prejudices our rule of life.[9]

Sufficient has been said and quoted to show how momentous the issue is. On all sides we are met by the spirit of passionate revolt or of blank indifference, the latter being doubtless the more deadly. The spirit of revolt is typified by such popular writers as D. H. Lawrence and Mr. Aldous Huxley. The latter in a volume of essays under the title *Do What You Will* argues for a new religion and morality with a wide tolerance of human desires and instincts. He claims, for example, that 'all the manifestations of life are godlike and every element of human nature has a right—a divine right even—to exist and find expression.' And again, 'we should raise our moral inconsistencies to the rank of a principle.' Lawrence's characters, as Mr. T. S. Eliot points out,[10] are not even aware of moral obligations, and he himself thus characterizes his own morality: 'God in me is my desire. Suddenly God moves afresh in me, a new motion. It is a new desire. So a plant unfolds leaf after leaf and then buds, till it blossoms. So do we, under the unknown

But the stone had not been touched; it was just a piece picked up in a quarry. Cf. also *The Meaning of Modern Sculpture*, by R. H. Wilenski, who sets himself to prove that everything save the work of negro image-makers is useless for all serious purposes of modern sculpture.

[1] See *The Relevance of Christianity*, by F. R. Barry.
[2] *Op. cit.*
[3] See *The Gospel and the Modern Mind*, by W. R. Matthews; and Matthews in *Christianity and the Crisis*
[4] *Op. cit.*
[5] Quoted by Hugh Martin in *Morality on Trial.*
[6] See *The Faith of a Moralist.*
[7] See *Christian Faith in Modern Light.*
[8] See *Counter-Attack from the East*, by C. E. M. Joad.
[9] Cf. Joad, *op. cit.*
[10] See *After Strange Gods.*

impulse of desires, which arrive in us from the unknown.'[1] Which surely merits Mr. T. S. Eliot's annihilating criticism, 'The man's vision is spiritual, but spiritually sick.'

The other great enemy—sheer indifference to all morality and religion—is working with deadly effect. Indeed there appears to be much truth in the late Bishop of London's remark that Christianity is to-day not so much opposed as ignored. There is abundant proof that a very large number of our contemporaries have no religion and desire none.

The 'Good-Timer.' The product of this moral chaos, whose chief characteristics we have noted, may be aptly described, it seems to me, as the 'good-timer.' The 'good-timer' is a man (or woman, of course) whose interests are confined strictly to this world, and whose life consists in getting what is popularly, though vaguely, known as 'a good time.' He claims a right to do more or less what he likes, is sceptical in matters of belief, and guided solely in matters of conduct by his desires. His gospel is sheer Hedonism. His 'religion' has been well portrayed in Mr. Bertrand Russell's *A Free Man's Worship* as a sort of cynical contempt for the omnipotent power, like Prometheus fixed to a rock and scorning Zeus. His attitude to such moral restraints and social bonds as those embodied in the family is one of either open rebellion or of quiet contempt, and he is appreciatively amused at the cynical gibe to the effect that the home is fast becoming the 'dormitory next door to the garage.' Above all he hurls himself into a constant round of pleasure so that he is left with no spare moment in which to become bored. 'You can carry a cushion instead of a cross—dress, feed and pamper yourself,' said the late and universally lamented Studdert Kennedy, and he has chosen the cushion.

But there are signs that the 'good-timer' is not as happy or as comfortable as he once was, and he is showing symptoms of depression and disillusion. Modern science has made him acquainted with the vastness of the universe around him and the insignificance of the little planet on which he lives, and has hinted at his own insignificance in the scheme of things. The new psychology has almost persuaded him that he is nothing more than the slave of his own subconscious self.[2] And, lastly, the two great wars have gone far to undermine his faith in the very humanity in which he put his trust and which he desired to make the measure of all things.[3] More and more deeply is he coming to feel that he is living in an unfriendly world in which chance and luck are supreme, and more and more evidently is he showing a desire for something that will give a meaning to life and offer some hope of salvation.

How can we Save the 'Good-Timer'? The problem that confronts any religion that is to endure appears to be the discovery of a way to win the 'good-timer.'

First of all it must be emphasized that he is not to be won by force, that is, the path to victory lies not in legislation. To close in his face the door of one means after another of indulging his passion for pleasure is not to win him but to embitter him and bid fair to lose him altogether. 'The testimony of all history,' writes Dr. Fosdick,[4] 'is that for the Church to pass to the realm of coercion, using political power to enforce laws which it has not yet persuaded the people to obey, is about the most dangerous business in which it can indulge.' Mr. Lloyd George, in a different context, teaches the same lesson, which the Church is yet far from learning: 'I realized clearly enough, what has since been demonstrated in the United States, that it is futile to legislate far in advance of popular opinion or the public conscience.'[5] Walter Pater tells of Marius the Epicurean seeing a gladiatorial combat: 'What was needed was the heart that would make it impossible to witness all this, and the future would be with the forces that could beget a heart like that.' That is the only policy that holds any hope of triumph; it is there that the battle must be waged. It is equally useless, as F. R. Barry has pointed out, to call men 'to renewed allegiance to standards about which they remain unconvinced.'

In short, we are witnessing very largely the condition in which Western Europe found itself in the first century of our era, and the situation which faces the Christian religion to-day is strikingly similar to that which faced it when it first entered Europe. There is the same loss of nerve, the same depression of heart, the same lack of definite belief in anything save blank endurance, the same tendency to resort to a type of existence which consists in 'getting on with the job' and trusting to luck; and, lastly, the same attempt to

[1] Quoted by Professor De Burgh in *The Hibbert Journal*, April 1934.

[2] For a good treatment of the New Psychology, its implications and results, see *The New Psychology and Religious Experience*, by Principal T. Hywel Hughes.

[3] F. R. Barry in *The Relevance of Christianity* notes the 'debunking' fashion in biography as evidence of this, and adds, 'The eroticism of "advanced" literature is a desperate confession of disbelief in the very human nature which it sets out to explore and glorify'; cf. also Joad, *A Guide to Modern Thought*, for the pessimism of modern literature.

[4] In *The Hope of the World.*

[5] See *War Memoirs*, i., regarding his struggle with the drink-traffic during the first World War.

'play safety' by trying to hold every available belief at once.

What, then, does the typical product of our New Age, whom we have suggested may be aptly described as the 'good-timer,' want? It seems that his demands may be summed up under three heads: Freedom, Happiness, and Something that will give some meaning to life and offer some hope for the future.

Let us examine them in turn.

Freedom. The question at once arises, freedom for what? If the answer is 'To do as he likes,' surely little thought is required to convince him that he is demanding the impossible. It goes to pieces on the rock of Kant's moral test, namely, can his life be universalized, that is, can everyone pursue it? Since our likes vary so much there must be clashing and chaos. Who or what is to decide whose likes or dislikes are to be supreme? But the man himself is not free. Professor Taylor[1] in criticizing Mr. Bertrand Russell's *The Free Man's Worship* pertinently remarks that it is neither freedom nor worship, for the man must be conscious of the presence of the object of his contempt and preoccupied with himself, so that he is not free.

If, again, the freedom he demands is freedom to indulge his instinctive desires, lusts and passions, equally brief reflection will show him that he is demanding freedom to make himself a slave, because in their disorganized state his instincts are merely a howling mob, and to surrender to them means to put himself under mob rule, slavery to the worst form of tyranny. Mr. T. S. Eliot rightly describes Lawrence's 'inner light' as the 'most untrustworthy and deceitful guide that ever offered itself to wandering humanity.' 'It would seem,' he adds, 'that for Lawrence any spiritual force was good and that evil resided only in absence of spirituality. . . . I fear that Lawrence's work may appeal not to those who are well and able to discriminate, but to the sick and debile and confused; and will appeal not to what remains of health in them, but to their sickness.'

Our age is a powerful witness to the truth of Dr. Barnes' words that in periods when the power of tradition is broken latent mental tendencies reassert themselves, and that while we think we are going forward we may be just 'harking back to the dim past of the race.'[2]

But the answer is much more likely to be 'Freedom to express himself'; and here we are faced with the very popular modern cult of self-expression. That each one of us is endowed with a personality for which he can and should find expression is a truth to which everyone will agree. The disagreement is about the meaning of the term 'self-expression.' One of the most evident features of recent years is that 'self-expression' has been very universally identified with the expression of individual instincts separately, which is not the expression of self but only of part of self. Moreover, there is no freedom in such 'self-expression,' for it must involve conflict. 'When we act according to impulse we are not free, because there is always antagonism between the self and the expression of the repressed complex or instinct.' Freedom demands harmony; and this leads us naturally to the second demand, namely, the demand for happiness. We suggest that what our 'good-timer' has been driving at all the time is 'I want freedom to be happy.'

Happiness. Once again we must be careful of our language and be sure that we are not talking of 'happiness' and thinking of 'pleasure.' The distinction between them has been well drawn by Dr. Hadfield: 'Pleasure is the feeling tone which accompanies the emotional expression of any one instinct. Happiness is the feeling tone we experience when all the instinctive emotions are expressed in harmony.'[3] Nor must we think that the latter can be attained by multiplying the former; it depends on harmonizing and organizing and synthesizing. The completely harmonized self is the completely free self and the completely free self is the completely happy self. Freedom and happiness, then, both depend on the unity of the whole personality; neither of them can be found, both must be created. The completely harmonized self is more than the 'expressed' self, it is the realized self. How, then, is the self to be completely unified? We answer, only around an adequate ideal. And we must be very careful to stress the 'adequacy' of the ideal, for there are inadequate ideals and, to quote Dr. Hadfield again, 'a man may put his whole will and soul' into the pursuit of an inadequate ideal. The adequate ideal is one which contents men when they are what they ought to be.[4] 'The only truly free and happy man is he whose instincts are all organized in the pursuit of a consciously chosen purpose which welds together the personality into a harmonious whole.'

We are, therefore, led once more naturally and finally to the third demand, namely, for something which will give life a meaning and offer some hope for the future.

The position to which our argument has led us is that the first concern of man must be to unify his whole personality around an adequate ideal. 'Nearly all of us want something to hold us

[1] In *The Faith of a Moralist.*
[2] See *Should Such a Faith Offend?*
[3] See his *Psychology and Morals.*
[4] Taylor, *op. cit.*

together,' writes Mr. H. G. Wells,[1] 'something to dominate this swarming confusion and save us from the black misery of wounded and exploded pride, of thwarted desire, of futile conclusions. We want more oneness, some steadying thing that will afford an escape from fluctuations.' Apart from this 'oneness' life is merely a number of separate and independent activities of which 'one damned thing after another' is a true, if crude, description.

It is this lack of unity and consequent dispersion which are perhaps more than anything responsible for the pessimism and disillusion of our time—a feeling that life doesn't get anywhere.

The one and all-embracing good, the sole adequate ideal around which man's personality can be unified, unity with which must be the supreme purpose of man's life, is God; and the dynamic which will set men free and make them happy, fill them with inspiration for the present and hope for the future, has its source and strength in the conviction that that God is Love—the Father of Our Lord Jesus Christ, behind all and through all and in all, 'in whom we live and move and have our being.'

[1] *First and Last Things.*

In the Study.

Virginibus Puerisque.

The Fly that wasn't Recognized.

By the Reverend John B. Nettleship, B.A., B.D., Carlisle.

'They took knowledge of them, that they had been with Jesus.'—Ac 4[13].

Those of you who listen to the Broadcasts for Schools may have heard some very interesting talks by Professor H. Munro Fox on the animal mind. He told of some of the senses which animals possess which we don't have. For example, he said that fishes have a sense which tells them when they are swimming towards a rock, so that they are able to avoid bumping into it, even if it is dark.

One of the most curious things he described, however, was an experiment with a spider and a fly. As soon as the spider sees a fly in its web, it attacks it and gobbles it up. Now you would imagine that a spider would do just the same with a fly wherever it saw it. But in fact it doesn't. Professor Fox says that if a fly is put before a spider away from its web, the fly is not attacked but the spider moves rapidly away from it! Apparently the fly looks quite different to the spider when seen on its web, and away from it. The fly is only recognized when it is on the spider's web.

You know, I think there are a lot of people who call themselves Christians of whom a rather similar thing is true. You see them going to Church on Sunday, you hear them joining heartily in the singing of the hymns and saying their prayers, and you think you can see quite plainly that they are Christians.

But suppose you see the same people at work, or playing a game, or quarrelling with their friends —often at other places than Church, and on other days than Sundays, they don't look like Christians at all. You would never recognize them as the people who looked so good at Church!

One of the things we all need to learn is that Christianity is not just for Church and Sunday—it is for all times and all places. When we are playing our games people should be able to recognize us as Christians by our absolute fairness, by the way we can win without getting 'uppish,' and lose without grumbling. When we are at school other boys and girls should be able to see that we are Christians because we work hard and happily, because we refuse to cheat, or do anything that is mean or dishonest. When we are at home we shall show we are followers of Jesus by our love and obedience and helpfulness.

It ought to be perfectly clear always that we are Christians by the words we speak and the things we do.

Our text is taken from an incident which tells about Peter and John being brought before the High Priest and rulers. It would have been quite easy for Peter and John to have denied all knowledge of the charge they were accused of. But they were not afraid to speak the truth, and when the people heard what they said, we are told that 'when they saw the boldness of Peter and John . . . they took knowledge of them, that they had been with Jesus.' How grand it would be if we were always so brave and true that people could see at once that we were followers of Jesus. There is a verse of a hymn which you will probably understand better when you get older, but I think, young as you are, you will have some idea what it means:

I'm not ashamed to own my Lord,
Or to defend His cause,
Maintain the honour of His Word,
The glory of His Cross.

Humpty Dumpty.

By the Reverend Ivan F. Tibbs, M.A.,
Rigside, Lanark.

'Looking unto Jesus . . .'—He 12^{2}.

One evening I was looking at a picture; and when I looked at it, it reminded me of what I had had for my tea. Only this one wasn't cooked and it was grinning at me with a naughty look in its eye. It was oval-shaped at the top, and at the bottom it had two funny little legs and two little arms; and its body seemed to be a mixture of a collar, a waistcoat and a pair of shorts all rolled into one. Do you know what it was? Beside the picture was written:

Humpty Dumpty sat on a wall,
Humpty Dumpty had a great fall.
All the king's horses and all the king's men
Couldn't put Humpty Dumpty together again.

If one day your egg began to grin at you and wave an arm, you would have an awful fright, wouldn't you?

But perhaps you have never seen a Humpty Dumpty. I did one day. There was a road and the road crossed the railway. Well, there he was on the wall of the bridge as large as life. I always thought Humpty Dumpty sat on the wall: the rhyme says so. But this was not *the* Humpty Dumpty; just *a* Humpty Dumpty. So he was much bolder than the first Humpty. He was actually standing on the wall and walking along it nearer and nearer to the middle where the railway lines run down below. At first he went quite boldly, and then he must have looked down and become giddy. I found that he was down on hands and knees crawling very carefully, obviously afraid in case he had a great fall. Because if a railway engine ran over him and cut him in two, no one would be able to put him together again. He was a very foolish boy. If you had asked him his name, he would probably have said it was Angus McTavish, or John Smith, or something like that. But you and I know he was really a kind of Humpty Dumpty, just asking to have a great fall.

But, you know, walls aren't the only things that people can fall from. (You can fall out of the window.) You can fall off a 'bus. And when that happens everyone who sees you knows that you have fallen, and a great shout will go up. 'Help! David, Margaret, has fallen out of the 'bus.' And everyone will rush to help you.

But sometimes people fall, and those who are with them don't see it; though it is happening in front of their very eyes. When people fall this way, they don't fall on to the ground at all. And a very terrible way to fall it is, too. Because if people don't notice that we have fallen, how can they pick us up again and mend us? What is this terrible invisible way of falling? It's a falling of the part inside us that feels and thinks and makes us do things. Sometimes that part falls far, far away from Jesus and makes us do the most unkind and horrid things. People who love Jesus may be able to tell when that happens by the kind of things we say and do. But not everyone can. It's a dreadful thing to fall away from Jesus, because when that happens we need to be mended inside; and you can bring all the king's doctors and any other doctors you like, and they can sew you up with all the needles and thread they've got; but it will not make the slightest bit of difference to you. Their needles and bandages cannot help the part that needs to be mended; because it is right away inside. No, but Jesus can. And that is why we call Him our Saviour. Because He comes and saves us when others can't. If you fall away from Jesus and do things He does not like, ask Him to forgive you and help you back on to the way in which you should go—and if you really mean it, He will.

But it is better still to keep from falling. When a boy walks along a high wall, if he looks down he becomes dizzy and is in danger of falling. If he keeps his eyes off the ground and looks straight ahead, he will find it much easier. That is true in this case also. If you don't want to fall from Jesus' ways, don't keep looking down to see what other girls and boys do and say. Look straight ahead to Jesus who has gone on to heaven before you. Pray to Him. See what He is like from the Bible. Follow Him. That is the best way.

The Christian Year.

Septuagesima.

The Call to Endurance.

By the Reverend Dr. W. F. Howard,
Birmingham.

'In your endurance ye shall win your souls.'—Lk 21^{19}.

This is St. Luke's paraphrase of the saying recorded in St. Matthew (24^{13}) in the form, 'He that endureth to the end, the same shall be saved.' In the Jewish world of thought the activity of the redeeming God works to a climax at the end of the age. Salvation consists in sharing in the life of the heavenly kingdom which will be established after the trials and tribulations that mark the passing of the present age. Only he who endures to the furthest limit will be saved by enjoying an abundant entrance into the Kingdom of God.

In St. Luke's form of the saying a different figure is used to convey the same promise. The final salvation is to win one's soul. This is a thought which we often find in the words of Jesus. 'Whosoever would save his soul shall lose it, but whosoever shall lose his soul for my sake, the same shall save it. For what is a man profited if he gain the whole world, and lose or forfeit his own self?'

Jesus Himself, so tender in dealing with the weak and the broken in body and spirit, is constantly making inexorable demands on those who would be His disciples. They must be prepared to suffer hardship, 'to scorn delights and live laborious days,' to drink the same cup and to be immersed in the same raging sea of troubles as their Master. Irresolution is fatal. 'No man

having put his hand to the plough and looking back is fit for the kingdom of God.' The making of character is all-important. This insistence is found in every part of the New Testament. So St. Paul writes, 'We triumph even in our troubles, knowing that trouble produces endurance, endurance produces character, and character produces hope—a hope which never disappoints us, since God's love floods our hearts through the holy Spirit which has been given to us' (Ro 5^{3-5}, Moffatt). So St. James writes, 'Blessed is he who endures under trial; for when he has stood the test, he will gain the crown of life which is promised to all who love Him' (Ja 1^{12}, Moffatt).

How different this is from the flabby sentimentality which excuses weak self-indulgence by prating about the 'dangers of repression,' and which talks glibly about the 'need of self-expression,' without first seeing to it that there is a self that is worth expressing! The history of mankind from the beginning is epitomized in the fashioning of every soul. For long ages the creative process was at work,

Till at the last arose a man;

Who throve and branch'd from clime to clime,
The herald of a higher race,
And of himself in higher place,
If so he type this work of time

Within himself, from more to more;
Or, crown'd with attributes of woe
Like glories, move his course, and show
That life is not as idle ore,

But iron dug from central gloom,
And heated hot with burning fears,
And dipt in baths of hissing tears,
And batter'd with the shocks of doom

To shape and use.

Such is the school of discipline in which the Christian character is formed. But it is no passive method of treatment to which we are called to submit. It is unfortunate that the virile quality of the Greek word for endurance is so often disguised, even in the Revised Version, by the translation 'patience.' Patience is a passive virtue, endurance an active one. Patience has the stamp of spiritual refinement which suffering borne with unmurmuring resignation leaves on a noble soul. Endurance is that masculine virtue which carries on the task and bears up under every blow of adversity until the end is reached and victory is won. J. R. Lowell describes the inflexible courage of Columbus in continuing his voyage in spite of the fears and scepticism of his companions.

Endurance is the crowning quality,
And patience all the passion of great hearts;
These are their stay, and when the leaden world
Sets its hard face against their fateful thought,
And brute strength, like the Gaulish conqueror,
Clangs his huge glaive down in the other scale,
The inspired soul but flings his patience in,
And slowly that outweighs the ponderous globe,—
One faith against a whole earth's unbelief,
One soul against the flesh of all mankind.

The Greek word is sometimes rendered 'steadfastness' and sometimes 'fortitude.' One of John Buchan's finest characters is Piet Pienaar, 'Mr. Standfast.' When the Old Boer scout, fighting on the Allied side in the first World War, had crashed in his plane, and was lying for months on his back, crippled, he spent long hours reading his Bible and *The Pilgrim's Progress*. He wrote to his friend Hannay, 'But the big courage is the cold-blooded kind that never lets go even when you're feeling empty inside, and your blood's thin, and there's no kind of fun or profit to be had, and the trouble's not over in an hour or two but lasts for months and years. One of the men here was speaking about that kind, and he called it Fortitude. I reckon fortitude's the biggest thing a man can have—just to go on enduring when there's no guts or heart left in you. . . . But the head man at the job was the Apostle Paul.'

The Apostle Paul certainly knew the secret of endurance. It lies in the self-help that springs from Divine help. 'Work out your own salvation with fear and trembling for it is God who works in you both to will and to work.' That is why he can also say, 'I can do all things in Him who enables me.' Christian endurance is confident of the result because faith, and hope, and love engage us in a service of loyalty which is 'toil co-operant to an end.' The same Apostle writes about 'your work of faith, and endurance of hope, and labour of love.'

We are living in an age when the faith of many has suffered eclipse. The earlier hopefulness with which so many started out in life has given way to disillusionment as a second world war within one generation has crashed into their home-life and shattered so much that they had bravely built up. The mood of depression has invaded every class, worship is neglected, the Church is regarded as an obsolete institution, family religion has almost disappeared. Loyalty to Christ and His cause is not easy to practise in these days. But it is just these conditions which call out the heroic qualities in those who believe still that Christ has the one word that is relevant and adequate to the present situation. Not long after the execution of the Apostle Paul, when persecution was driving many to apostasy, and others were asking whether the Christian religion after all was worth the sacrifices that it demanded, a stalwart leader arose who wrote an appeal, that we call 'The Epistle to the Hebrews,' to put fresh heart into some waverers. 'Let us run with endurance the race that is set before us, looking away to the pioneer and perfecter of our faith, even Jesus, who for the joy that was set before Him, endured a cross, trampling upon its shame, and has now sat down at the right hand of the throne of God.' With such a heroic example, and such a living inspiration, the same writer gave a challenge that rings true to our present need. 'Cast not away your confidence, for great is the reward it holds. For you have need of endurance, so that you may do the will of God and obtain what He has promised to you. . . . But we are not the men to turn back and lose all, but to have faith and win our souls.'

SEXAGESIMA.

Pilgrimage.

'Canst thou by searching find out God?'—Job 11^7.
'And the Word was made flesh, and dwelt among us.'—Jn 1^{14}.

Job's question is more ancient than Job, older than the Old Testament. But if the question is as old as man, the answer is as new as Christianity. The search for the Infinite began in very rudimentary forms—in the mists and darkness of a forgotten world and, by the divine ingenuity of Deity, the pilgrimage progressed into the light.

That the feeble hands and helpless,
Groping blindly in the darkness,
Touch God's right hand in that darkness
And are lifted up and strengthened.

In a mixture of awe and thankfulness for seeds sown and harvests garnered those early seekers raised up their idols to fertility, to the sun, moon, stars, the beasts of the field, and the creatures of the air and sea.

Man the pilgrim, questing for the infinite,
Moving upward through the ages
Of the world's primeval night.
Prophecies of seers and sages—
Nature's own recorded pages:
Thus in such things round about him,
Prompted by the spirit in him
That can never be denied;
O the pilgrim soul in you,
When shall it be satisfied?

The study of religions has shown that no tribe has yet been discovered which did not contribute, in some way, to the search for God. The crumbling dust of a million idols stands witness; the taboos, rites, disgusting and revolting as many of them were, reveal man as the eternal adventurer after the Eternal.

The roads, then, upon which the ages have trod are many, but, like the little lanes and byways that, sooner or later merge into the great highways, so the beliefs, practices and ideologies of men have merged into three predominant pilgrimages—philosophy, science and religion.

Consider then the *pilgrimage of science*.

Nobility was here for certain. With Truth their guiding star, they were led on in an attempt to unravel the riddle of the Universe. There were secrets in the skies, so they measured the stars; there were secrets in the earth, so they tapped the rocks; the stars taught them immensity, and the rocks antiquity; a thousand years became as a day and the earth as a speck of dust. 'I have given up praying,' says one of these adventurers. 'It seems so utterly incredible to me that a God who controls all universes and inhabits all time can have patience to hear me speak to Him about my examinations, my love affairs, my prospects.'

The pilgrimage of science, great and heroic as it was, brought man to a place where the immensity of things overwhelmed him, and so, placing too much importance on the conception of size, he became a sceptic, viewing himself as 'a parasite infesting the epidermis of a midge among the planets' or, using Bertrand Russell's phrase, 'brief and powerless is Man's life; on him and all his race the slow, sure doom falls pitiless and dark.'

But science was not the only movement. Dealing primarily with concrete facts, scientists refused to evolve a theory or establish a law until they had proved its worth by tangibles, but there were other pilgrims, questing for Truth through the realms of the mind: they began *the pilgrimage of philosophy*.

The earlier adventurers sought to explain the Deity, Nature, and Man. 'Philosophy,' said Plato, 'is the acquisition of knowledge, a resembling of the Deity in so far as that is possible to man.' 'It is the rational pursuit of true happiness,' said Epicurus. Adventuring in abstractions, they sought for the cause of goodness, evil, wisdom. They walked in a world of colour and wonder, and from beautiful effects they assumed the existence of beautiful causes. Catching the perfume of flowers and every loveliness in life, they conceived of an Ultimate Loveliness somewhere.

But there was a darker side to the picture these pilgrims were painting: life was beauty, but life could be ugliness too. They saw a world where Nature was indeed 'red in tooth and claw'; a world of violets and vermin, of peace and pain—a world of contradiction.

It was a pilgrimage which, rather like the scientific, left men baffled. Sometimes it brought them to the high places of the spirit, but more often it brought them perplexing uncertainty wherein they fancied God was very much like a watchmaker who, in creating, had left his creation to get on as best it could.

But there was another adventure towards God—an adventure which did not attempt to search for Divinity through the message of the stars and rocks and the contradictions of Nature, but through and in the message and face of a man.

Men made experiments in the realm of matter, and they called it 'science.' They made experiments in the realm of mind, and they called it 'philosophy.' But earlier still, they searched in the realm of the spirit, and they called it 'religion.' It was a broad term; used indiscriminately, it covered a multitude of sins, but in its best sense it pointed to good and great men of many faiths making sincere attempts to spiritual affinity with their Maker.

They prayed to a God who had made all things good in His time, yet as they prayed they were troubled by the awful contradictions that made up their environment. There were earthquakes, famines, pestilence, and sword; there was the suffering of the innocent, the eternal questions of life and death; no wonder it was that even good men were perplexed. The great and aching question of man had to be answered: Who *was* this God?

In the fullness of time, the answer came. The *pilgrimage of religion* found its climax in the answer Christianity gave to the world. The pilgrimage of Christianity was in fact the end of a pilgrimage.

There was one grand channel through which

God could and did work; He will speak to man in man's language; He will meet man on man's ground; He will show man how God does work, how God does think and love and understand; He will clothe His Thought and Love and Understanding in flesh, and so, the 'Word which was God became flesh and dwelt among us.'

Nothing that is abstract can be grasped by the mind until it is 'made flesh.' My old German master, anxious to teach us the language, explained every word to us by 'making it flesh.' He would shout, 'Der Tisch,' and point with emphatic gesture to the table; he would cry, 'Der Stuhl,' and at once sweep a chair off the floor and hold it high.

A boy of twelve was asked the other day what he thought love was. 'My mother is love,' he replied. There is little philosophy about love in the mind of a boy of twelve, but when such a boy has such a mother, then he has seen love made flesh before his eyes, he has seen it working and has truly beheld its glory.

God speaks to men in a similar language. The very inmost heart of the eternal is made flesh and dwells among men.

The utter simplicity of it is startling.

Bethlehem: a little Babe all wreathed in smiles —*God*, the Word made flesh.

Cana: a wedding and a feast with joy and love crowning the day—*God*, the Word made flesh.

Calvary: a man slung up in human agony, smitten of men—*God*, the Word made flesh.

Man reaches the end of his long pilgrimage to God when he sees love nailed to a Cross. His long journey is finished when he cries for mercy and knows that his Lord will understand.

And yet, it is not the end of the adventure. The quest of the wise men and the shepherds finished when they came to Bethlehem and knelt before a Babe, but with one journey over another began, for, 'the shepherds returned, glorifying and praising God.' True praise corresponds with true living. Now, the practical implications of the Christian adventure fit in with the Divine purpose, for the eternal quest of man for God is not merely a pilgrimage for mystics; it is the quest of Everyman.

The process is indisputable. When a man finds goodness, purity, love, forgiveness made flesh in Jesus, he has no real satisfaction until he makes it flesh himself, by living it out honourably in his own life—therein lies the purpose of God. The Christian pilgrimage becomes the Christian crusade.[1]

Quinquagesima.

Love . . . Boldness . . . Judgment.

By the Reverend Canon T. H. W. Barker, Kempston, Bedford.

'Herein is love made perfect with us, that we may have boldness in the day of judgement; because as he is, even so are we in this world.'—1 Jn 4^{17} (RV).

The last verses of this chapter may be looked upon as the amplifying of Jesus' words in the Gospel (13^{34}). No less than twenty-eight times in fifteen verses does St. John write the word *agape*, or its derivatives. This First Epistle, indeed, is the writer's commentary on the great Mandatum Novum. God's love for us, our love for God, together with our love for the brethren—this is the abiding-place, the only mansion, for the disciple. This threefold love is the text on which St. John the Elder based all his discourses to his little children in Christ. When they tired, and asked for something new, as children will, his reply was inevitable, 'I have no other message.' Love is his text and love is his commentary, because love is Christianity, and God is love.

It is not difficult to think of a disciple going to St. John in obedience to the Apostolic injunction, 'Confess your sins one to another.' In shame, and with tears in his eyes, tears in his voice, he confesses his grievous sins, 'the lust of the flesh, the lust of the eyes, and the vainglory of life'—all the sins to which a young man is most prone. At the end of his confession he tells of his dislike, perhaps even his hatred, of one of the brethren. It is not only in a Spanish cloister that such hatred can flourish. To his amazement his confessor passes quickly over what he thought were his heinous sins, and fastens sternly and sadly on the sin of dislike or hatred of a brother. 'If a man,' he says, 'love not his brother whom he hath seen, how, how can he, how can he love God whom he hath not seen? This commandment have we from Him, that he who loveth God love his brother also.'

'Herein,' says St. John, 'is love made perfect with us, that we may have boldness in the day of judgment.' Love, and boldness the outcome of love, in the day of judgment.

Boldness at first sight seems a strange consequence of love. Boldness would not appear the quality we should most like to possess as we stand before the Judgment Seat. We tend in ordinary speech to deprecate the adjective 'bold.' 'If I may make so bold' we say. 'As bold as brass' does not commend itself as a favourable description of anybody. Boldness would scarcely be fitting when we find ourselves where no excuses will avail, no money buy off, and no friends be present to help us, and where, if anywhere, conscience maketh cowards of us all. But the term St. John uses is *parresia*, a word not uncommon in the New Testament. It means free-spokenness, openness, frankness. It is used by some of them of Jerusalem, of Jesus Himself—'Lo, He speaketh openly.' St. Paul, says Barnabas, 'had preached boldly in the name of Jesus.' 'Apollos began to speak boldly concerning Jesus.' This freedom to speak was much thought of by the Athenians, it was the right of a free man. In a country coming under the sway of a dictator it is the first privilege to be taken away.

The opposite of this boldness is seen in the behaviour of the man who came to the wedding breakfast without a wedding garment. When asked the reason for this incivility, 'he was speechless.' So when Christ the King speaks to a man, if that man be speechless he stands self-

[1] N. N. G. Cope, *The Night is Ending*, 152.

condemned. In the presence of Jesus, unto whom all hearts be open, all desires known, and from whom no secrets are hid, we need this *parresia*, this frankness, this perfect candour which love alone can give, more than anywhere else. The opposite of it may be that dumb insolence which is treated as a crime in the Army. To be silent in ordinary life is often sheer cowardice. The Christian soldier must speak up against what is wrong; speak up for what he believes; speak up for some one who is in need of his help. In doing this there comes a wonderful certainty that God abideth in us; that His love is being perfected in us; that He is giving us of His Spirit. We find that we can exercise this glorious boldness—we can speak openly. What a deal of good it can do!

A lady who was going out to tea asked if she might bring her son with her, an officer lately released from a German prisoner of war camp. She hinted that it would not be wise to speak to him of his experiences. (Surely no person in his senses would have dreamed of doing anything so inconsiderate.) Amongst other horrors, the boy had been tortured, and twice put up against a wall to be shot, in enemy efforts to make him reveal what he knew of our dispositions. But he, brave lad, kept silence. It is, however, very clear that sometimes he should be prevailed upon to talk frankly of his nightmare of suffering, and so gradually get rid of it, rather than keep it under all the time, and all the time troubling his subconscious mind. Few of us care to think much of the hour of our death, and fewer still are prepared to speak openly about it. And because we feel that it is a morbid subject for conversation, we keep it shut away, like a skeleton in the cupboard of our mind. But all the time the fear of death remains with us, lurking in the shadows of that dim subconscious realm, spoiling the sunshine of life. It is only when we are prepared, sometimes, to speak of it frankly and openly, that the sting is largely taken away.

Love begets boldness—in the Day of Judgment. It is miserable folly to try to expunge all thought of that day from our minds. Christ shall indeed come to judge the quick and the dead. One day will certainly be the last day. But it is impossible, surely, to imagine that all that St. John has to say about love, our love for God, our love for our neighbour, God's love for us, is all and only in preparation for the last day, which may be to-morrow or it may be in a million years' time; is all and only that we may have boldness in the Day of Judgment. Is not the very word *crisis* or judgment a common fact in everyday life? Crises are daily events for all men. Every decision for right or wrong is a crisis, a decision, and at every such decision Jesus is present with us. Or we may put it the other way round. Whenever we feel that He is present there is a crisis, a judgment to be passed, a decision to be made by us. St. John the Apostle faced such a judgment, made such a decision when, with the rest, he forsook his Master and fled. So did St. Peter when he denied his Master, and Jesus turned and looked upon Peter.

Jesus will certainly come again as Judge, and the word for that coming is *parousia*. It is equally certain that He is continually coming to men and nations, and His every coming is a crisis and a judgment. Indeed such *crisis* or judgment, such coming, are almost interchangeable terms. St. John's words, 'because as He is, even so are we *in this world*' appear to clinch the matter, and show that he is not thinking only of the final Day of Judgment. Like the writer of the Epistle to the Hebrews, he has in mind the throne of grace as well as the throne of judgment. 'Let us therefore draw near *with boldness* unto the throne of grace, that we may receive mercy and find grace to help us in time of need' all our days. And to make this point completely clear we have only to look at those other words of St. John in this Epistle (2^{28}), 'My little children, abide in him; that, if he shall be manifested,'—to-day, to-morrow, or the next day, as He shall certainly be manifested in the last day—'we may have boldness, and not be ashamed before him at his coming.'

FIRST SUNDAY IN LENT.

Helps in Temptation.

BY THE REVEREND PHILIP W. LILLEY, M.A., RHU, DUMBARTONSHIRE.

'For in that he himself hath suffered being tempted, he is able to succour them that are tempted.—He 2^{18}.

One of the incontrovertible facts we know about human nature is simply this, that men and women are subject to temptation from the beginning of their life to its close. Because they are human, they will never be free from its persistent onslaught. From one point of view the Bible is just the record of people who were tempted to do evil and fell or rose again to fight better. That is the sort of thing we may expect for ourselves to-day. It would therefore be foolish if we did not lay our account with such conditions of mortal life. It is unwise also to forget that 'temptation is not sin, involves no necessity of sin, although it brings the possibility of sin.'

But it would be equally shortsighted not to bear in mind that we are never left to ourselves in the narrow straits of testing and trial. St. Paul has told us plainly that there is nothing unique in the fact that we are tempted folk; nor need we imagine that we of all people have been the target for a peculiarly virulent assault. 'There hath no temptation taken you but such as is common to man.' St. Paul also greatly enheartens us by this wonderful assurance, 'God is faithful, who will not suffer you to be tempted above that ye are able; but will with the temptation also make a way to escape, that ye may be able to bear it.' If we could only realize it, we are surrounded at all times by Divine helps and reinforcements of our better selves. It is not enough, however, for us to know them, we must also *use* them in the hour of need. What practical helps then are at our disposal?

1. First, it is of paramount importance that we should frankly recognize the real nature of what is alluring us and *call it by its right name*. It is in the secret places of the soul that it is so easy to yield to self-sophistication; and it is just there that the issue of the battle is often decided. For when we hide from ourselves the true character of shady actions and employ specious words to describe them, we are often taking the first false step which brings us into misery. In a powerful and eloquent lecture delivered during the recent war, Emeritus-Professor McNeile Dixon spoke very strongly about the necessity of thinking straight and speaking straight concerning evil things and of calling them by their right names. He said, 'When I find myself at any of the famous cross-roads of thought, where the darkness thickens and decisions are hard, I retire for my encouragement upon certain convictions, fixed stars in my little firmament. Here is an instance. Whatever men elect to call them, I continue to believe that deceit remains deceit, cruelty cruelty, treachery treachery, kindness kindness, as certainly as food is food, and poison poison, and that villainy, however successful, is still villainy.' Now in the hour of temptation this is precisely what we must do for ourselves. For it is just then that we are prone to call sin by every name except its right name, for example, to confuse love with lust, manliness with tippling, honourable business with sharp practice. But complete honesty with ourselves will enable us to take the first step towards gaining the captaincy of our souls. To do this and keep on doing it we must first effect the 'moral pause,' and then using all our moral insight speak very plainly and unambiguously to our own souls.

2. A second help is *the remembrance of our home and our best friends*. When we remember these dear ones, we set up a rallying-point in the onset where the soul can gather together its strength and put to flight the insidious temptation. In *Sand, Wind and Stars*, a very striking book by a French writer (Exupéry), the author relates how he and a comrade crashed in the desert of Africa and wandered about aimlessly for miles. Their thirst and fatigue were almost unbearable. They were on the verge of utter collapse, their uppermost desire was simply to fall down in the sand and sleep. Exupéry tells how he was enabled to resist this overwhelming desire and how he was saved from death. 'I was haunted by a vision of my wife's eyes under the halo of her hat. Of her face I could see only the eyes questioning me and looking at me yearningly. "I am answering, answering with all my strength," I would exclaim. I was perfectly ready to fall asleep whether for a night or for eternity. If I did fall asleep, I could not know whether for a night or for eternity. But that cry that would be set up at home, that great cry of desolation! That was what I could not bear.' So he came through the wilderness and was saved.

Now so it is with you and me when we are in the desert with the wild beasts of temptation. These are occasions when we are sorely tempted to forget and let the finest part of our nature sleep the sleep of death. In such a crisis the Tempter whispers, 'No one cares about you, so why should *you* care? and why rob yourself of this innocent pleasure?' It is just then that for our very life we should cry aloud, 'Some one *does care* very deeply. I will not be a craven and yield.' 'That cry that would be set up at home, that great cry of desolation.' Remember your home and all who trust you there. The bare recollection of them will be a shield and a buckler.

3. Thirdly, *be stern with yourself in little things* as well as big. Life imposes considerable discipline upon us in external ways. That is inevitable. Apart from these, however, we have the opportunity, day by day, of keeping a good look-out upon our inner life. We can be vigilant and unrelentingly severe with ourselves, as we become alarmingly aware of our dread of discomfort or pain, our avid love of praise and petty self-indulgences. William James has a very helpful chapter on 'Habit' which should be read by us from time to time. He says, 'Keep the faculty of effort alive in you by a little gratuitous effort every day. . . . Be systematically heroic in little unnecessary points, do every day or two something for no other reason than its difficulty, so that when the hour of dire need draws nigh, it may find you not unprepared and untrained to stand the test.'

Salutary counsel, especially when we remember that we are all walking bundles of habit, and that every day in little often apparently negligible actions we are either building up or subtly undermining our moral strength. In *Romola* George Eliot has given us a terrifying picture of the slow downfall of Tito Melema, that weak and comfort-loving man who betrayed the best he had ever known. She speaks of 'that inexorable law of human souls whereby we prepare ourselves for sudden deeds by the reiterated choice of good or evil which gradually determines character.'

4. Finally, and supremely, look ever to *Jesus Christ who is the mighty deliverer* of all tempted people. He can and does save us through His sympathy and Presence in the hour of trial. His sympathy is very real because He Himself was tempted all through His life. Christ did not enter the battle of life, clad, as it were, in bullet-proof armour. He was tempted in the wilderness, tempted to shun suffering, tempted by the hate and spite of men to despair of them, tempted on the Cross itself. He 'was tempted in all points like as we are, yet without sin.' In the hour of temptation we look for help from one who has known the pressure and enticement of evil and yet has not given way. We look for succour from one who is able to sympathize because He knows all that we are going through, understands the loneliness into which temptation always brings us and is acquainted with the struggles of our frail hearts. Because of His unique endowments and His victory we look up into His face. When we realize His Presence with us and hear His voice, we know that He is an ally who will stand by us to the end of the fight. In the days

of His flesh evil spirits trembled and cowered as He drew near. 'His touch has still its ancient power' to cast out the demon and set us free. When we are sore pressed, we must make our cry unto Him who is mighty and pray to Him who will hear and answer and save us from ourselves.

In the hour of trial,
Jesus, pray for me,
Lest by base denial
I depart from Thee;
When Thou seest me waver,
With a look recall,
Nor for fear or favour
Suffer me to fall.

That is a prayer He will certainly heed. He will not suffer us to perish in the end. For, as Dr. James Reid says, 'Jesus not only makes goodness visible, He makes it lovable. He reveals it in its highest form and its deepest power to win our hearts.'

Miracle.

By E. L. Allen, M.A., Ph.D., Lecturer in Divinity, King's College, Newcastle-upon-Tyne.

The present-day scepticism on the subject of miracles has come about by a climatic change in opinion, the development of which can be traced through three clearly-defined stages.

To begin with, the medieval world-view, derived as it was from the teaching of the Church and from classical antiquity, had a simple and satisfying account of miracle to offer. God works, it was held, ordinarily through the medium of second causes, but as the First Cause, He reserves to Himself the right to operate directly should occasion require. It was further held that such occasions had risen with the foundation of the Church, when miracles were needed to authenticate a divine revelation, and might still arise when it was necessary to demonstrate who was, and who was not, among the saints. To use an analogy from modern life, the head of some vast concern may normally deal with his customers through his secretaries, but conditions are not inconceivable under which he would make a personal call on one of them.

The second stage was reached with the acceptance, in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, of the mechanical explanation of the world, under the influence of a succession of thinkers from Copernicus to Newton. The reign of applied mathematics was extended till it seemed as though no limit could be assigned to it, and the qualitative differences which Aristotle had classified by means of his categories came to be replaced by calculations in quantitative terms. Many of those who helped the mechanical view of the world to victory were themselves imbued with a deeply religious spirit and had no wish to rule out the possibility of divine intervention. The language of Boyle is emphatic enough: 'This doctrine is not inconsistent with the belief of any true miracle, for it supposes the ordinary and settled course of Nature to be maintained, without at all denying that the most free and powerful Author of Nature is able, whenever He thinks fit, to suspend, alter, or contradict those laws of motion which He alone at first established and which need His perpetual concourse to be upheld.'[1] Granted that the world is a machine, it was made by a Celestial Mechanic and He may redirect it from time to time, if He sees sufficient reason for doing so.

The third stage came in the eighteenth century, when it seemed that the Celestial Mechanic could be dismissed, as the machine would be self-regulating and self-repairing. In the famous words of Laplace, there was no need of such a hypothesis as the Creator. It is not difficult to see how this came about. Natural science must begin by abjuring any appeal to supernatural causation, for the very good reason that, human nature being what it is, once such causation is admitted, it will be brought in far too soon. Only when we have gone through the discipline of explanation—or description, if you prefer it so—in terms of factors already familiar to us, linking up the present with the past, can we do justice to, without abusing, the rôle of what we believe lies beyond these. The error was that a sound methodological principle was erected into a metaphysical dogma and the supernatural in any form was ruled out.

So much for the past. To-day the situation is an entirely different one, and that for three reasons. To begin with, science is no longer as certain of itself as it once was. Natural laws, the historian of science assures us, 'are only probably true, though the probability in favour of some of them may be so great as to approach, though never reach, certainty. A few years ago we all should have been willing to bet heavy odds that Newton's

[1] Quoted in Burtt, *Metaphysical Foundations of Modern Physical Science*, 194.

laws of gravity and the constancy of the chemical elements were accurately true, yet Einstein and Rutherford have proved us wrong.' [1] Since we no longer conceive of Nature as a closed and rigid system, there is no longer anything shocking in the suggestion that something would violate the uniformity of Nature. For the principle of the uniformity of Nature, it appears, governs, not the objective world, but our thinking about it. I suggest that we might speak instead of the principle of the continuity of knowledge. We resolve, that is to say, to assimilate new experiences to the old concepts or to revise the old concepts so as to bring new experiences under them, but not to admit an absolute break anywhere.

In the second place, the current use of such terms as 'creative evolution' and 'emergent evolution' shows how far we have departed from the strictly mechanical view of the world. We have to recognize that in Nature freedom and creativity are primary, uniformity and rigidity only secondary. They arise out of freedom either as means to its ends or as resistance to its upward thrust. Above all, the concept of emergent evolution makes it possible for us to see how the new may arise out of the old and yet not be reducible to it. There is a chemical basis for life, but life is not itself a mere series of chemical processes: the old categories will take us only so far, and then new ones have to be introduced. This brings before us a possibility which could not previously be envisaged: God may work a wonder, not by violating the consistencies of Nature, but by using them and building upon them.

Finally, we have learned from the study of the Bible and early periods in the history of religion where the roots of belief in miracle lie and what values it is meant to conserve.

The Old Testament writers, for example, worked with neither the medieval nor the modern concept of Nature. Many events which we should stamp as natural were for them clear instances of Divine operation. When the writer of Psalm 136 wishes to celebrate the Lord as One 'who alone doeth great wonders,' he goes on to speak of the creation of the heavenly bodies, the Exodus, and the Settlement in the Promised Land. Elihu bids Job give heed to the marvels which God works in the earth, and says of Him: 'Great things doeth he, which we cannot comprehend.' What exactly are those things? 'He saith to the snow, Fall thou on the earth; likewise to the shower of rain, and to the showers of his mighty rain.' [2] How sophisticated we have become, that we can imagine Nature to be a fixed and uniform system, while the vagaries of the weather continually remind us that variety is Nature's first law and uniformity only her second!

Of course, we must not make the mistake of supposing that the Ephraimite peasant or the merchant of Jerusalem lived habitually in the wonder and awe before the works of God which these poets express. No doubt, it was recognized then as it is now that what we call Nature presents us with certain recurring patterns, that she has regular and customary procedures, so to speak, so regular and customary indeed that we do not associate God ordinarily with them. Against this background certain events stood out; they were astounding, inexplicable, history-making in their character, and as such were acts of God in a peculiar sense.

Van der Leeuw has well summarised the significance at this stage of thought of the belief in the miraculous: 'The boundary line between miracles and the non-miraculous was very unsettled, and the decision on the matter was left to man; but still it was arrived at in accordance with the criterion of revelation: what does an event declare about the god or about divine activity? Thus the miracle is really a 'sign': the element of astonishment accompanies the significance of powerfulness and token. For the primitive mind, then, even the simple fact that it is raining may be a 'marvel' of God; it is merely a matter of the facts themselves declaring that they are media of revelation. . . . 'At its deepest roots belief in miracles declares nothing other than "there is a living God": certain objects, events, and persons are, as it were, given prominence as against the world as a whole. . . . Certain experiences are thrown into relief within the experiential whole and called miracles, in the sense of being acts of God.' [3]

The whole point of any assertion of the miraculous lies, for the religious spirit, just there, in the claim that there is a living God who counts and who acts. That is why some people cling so pathetically to the literal truth of every Old Testament story: to surrender Jonah's great fish is in their eyes to see God expelled from His world. For God as an idea or as a tendency in the cosmos does not really satisfy; our hearts cry out for God as a Person who makes a difference. That only seems guaranteed to us so long as we can be sure that, however closely we may be imprisoned within the system of Nature, God can break through the bars, and has actually done so more than once. But what if there is no such cage at all? What if we should substitute for it a flexible system of means by which God is continually engaged in communicating with us, His children? Must He then suspend that

[1] Dampier, *A Shorter History of Science*, 172.
[2] Job $37^{5ff.}$.
[3] *Religion in Essence and Manifestation*, 567 f.

system from time to time in order to deal with us more effectively? May He not rather, as was suggested above, utilize it as it is for higher purposes?

Berdyaev has given an account of miracle which exactly fits in with this possibility. He writes: 'A miracle in no way indicates a breach of any laws of nature whatever, it is the appearance of meaning in human life, disclosed in the sphere of nature which is subject to partial and particular laws. It is a break through of spiritual force into the natural order, which in its isolation appears to be subject to the reign and incidence of law.'[1] There are two points here which deserve special attention. Miracle is 'the appearance of meaning'; as van der Leeuw said, it is revelatory, a disclosure of who and what the divine agent is. Then it is only as the natural order is seen in abstraction from the rest of our experience that it appears rigid and the shades of the prison-house begin to close around us as we contemplate it. Rightly regarded, it is open from moment to moment to the divine creativity. I have just one criticism to offer of Berdyaev's position: it represents so drastic a change from the traditional concept of the miraculous that it would be better to adopt a new terminology altogether and to speak simply of 'acts of God.'

Can we now render our discussion more precise? Here is an event X. To this event many attitudes may be taken up, but I am concerned here only with two of them, those of the religious man and the scientist. The former discerns in X a depth of meaning, he derives from it illumination for his whole life, so that he declares without hesitation: 'This is the Lord's doing, and it is marvellous in our eyes.' The latter sets out to explain how X came to happen as it did, and he has no difficulty in discharging his task: he is able to state what combination of factors in accordance with known and observable regularities will have produced it. Now, according to the traditional view, these two accounts of the same event are mutually incompatible; the religious judgment can only maintain itself if it can find a gap somewhere in the causal description. What I am concerned to establish is that there is not in fact any such incompatibility, that both approaches to X are justified, and that the right metaphor would not be the discovery of a gap but the erection of a superstructure.

That an event may be open to both approaches, that it may be at once a single link in a chain of natural sequences and a personal communication, is surely matter of everyday experience. When, for example, General de Gaulle went to the microphone after the fall of France to address his fellow-countrymen, the whole process was one which lay within the provinces of the physicist and the radio engineer. But was it not also a heroic effort to redeem a nation, to rally the soul of a great, if thwarted and dismayed, people? And did not many of those whose receiving-sets were tuned in take something of this appeal at the same time into their souls and respond inwardly to the one who was speaking to them?

The call of the Hebrew prophet was associated often with some object of the most commonplace order. A basket of figs or a cooking-pot remained what it had always been, but while the illuminating moment endured it was fraught with a revelation from God. God speaks to the prophet by means of the known and familiar, investing them with a new significance as media of His personal communication. May we not suppose that what He does thus with objects, He does also with events? The triumphs of the spirit, whether in man or in God, are won not by disrupting the fixed patterns of Nature but by utilizing them for higher ends than they ordinarily subserve. If from one point of view the Cross was the inevitable outcome of the controversies between Jesus and the religious authorities of His time, above all, of the challenge He flung down by the Cleansing of the Temple, is it not also an occasion in which God draws near to us in mercy and love?

We may take as a specific instance of what is meant by the event X the crossing of the Red Sea. If we accept for this the explanation which Gressmann has offered, that a volcanic eruption raised the bed of the northern end of the Gulf of Akabah, thus making it fordable for the Hebrews, while as the eruption died away, the bed subsided in their rear, do we thereby invalidate the claim that God was in what happened? Not in the least, so far as I can see, especially if we remember that the event in question included something more than can be brought within that explanation: it included the man Moses with his prophetic vocation and his sense of mission for this people whom he had just led out of Egypt. When an art-student has learned all that he can of the circumstances which led to the production of a certain masterpiece and of the technique which the master employed at that stage in his career, he must not lose his capacity to stand before the painting in wonder and admiration. The full truth takes up into itself both assessments of the picture, and one of them is not to be opposed to the other.

It would seem, therefore, that what is essential in the belief in miracle, the claim, that is, that there is a living God who is active in this world, can be maintained apart from the traditional view of His acts as involving some interference with

[1] *Slavery and Freedom*, 99.

the normal course of Nature. Such acts are fundamentally signs, instances of revelation, salient points in the whole course of things which make clear what otherwise in it might be obscure to us, but they are built out of the same materials as our daily life yields to us. What, we must now ask, is there peculiar to an event which constitutes it a sign, a flash of God's self-disclosure, while others remain mere part of the common flux of happenings ?

Before we attempt to answer this question it is as well to note that there is a type of mind for which the sign of God's presence is discerned rather in the ordinary than in the exceptional, for which the supreme miracle is the order and beauty of the world in which we live. There will be those always who will find this story or that incredible, but in whom reverence will be evoked by the starry heavens above and the moral law within. Those very uniformities which daunt others will be to them the evidence that God is indeed present with His children. Some, however, will find Him rather in the striking and the unpredictable, the event which challenges us to reflection and reverence.

The question therefore remains to be answered : what do we mean when we speak of an event as a sign ? What entitles us to describe it as an act of God ? There can only be one answer to this question. The basis for any such judgment is in the spiritual and ethical quality of the event itself. It is not in its power, but in its holiness, that we have the ground for asserting that God has done it. The writers of the New Testament are fully aware that an event may be exceptional in character and the product of unmistakable power, even of supernatural power, and yet not be from God at all. On the other hand, what is fraught with holiness is from Him, is a point at which He enters our experience and shapes our world. Where holiness is, God is, and where it is absent, He is not. When we live through a moment which brings holiness to bear upon our souls, we know that we have witnessed a deed of God. It is thus the spiritual quality of what takes place and not its violation of Nature's precedents or the degree of power which it evinces, which stamps it as an act of God. We can see that in two instances.

The first is the prophetic consciousness. This admits of explanation from many angles : it may legitimately be dealt with under the general head of the ' psychology of religious experience,' and it can be traced back to the prophet's peculiar temperament or to his social condition even. But this only takes us a certain distance along the road to an appreciation, say, of Amos and his mission. When out of this man's words an absolute imperative speaks to our conscience, when as we listen to Him we know ourselves to be searched and judged by God—then, and only then, is it clear to us whence he has come.

The second illustration is that of Jesus Christ Himself. His life was, by ordinary standards, merely a trivial episode in what one historian has spoken of as ' the age of Herod ' ; His teaching had deep roots in the tradition of His people and His conviction of God was heavily indebted to the Jewish piety out of which He sprang ; finally, His death was an item in the criminal records of a Roman province. All that is part of the truth about Him, but there is another part which is discerned in the awe which comes over us, as it came over the Roman centurion, when we see His life go out in a final flame of self-sacrifice. Surely in Him the purity, the holiness, and the mercy of God enter our world as nowhere else. The supreme act of God, the one which most clearly demonstrates His power and elicits our reverence and gratitude, is the one which is fraught beyond all others with holy love.

Note.—Perhaps something should be said of the implications of this position for the historical study of miracle-stories. It has been urged that the fact that an event is explicable by known factors does not prevent its being, at a higher level, a deed of God. The reverse holds true, so that if it is claimed that God was at work in a past event, this cannot on that ground be put outside the ordinary procedures of historical and scientific enquiry. Whether the results reached in that way will respect or will invalidate the claim put forward for the event in question will depend not on any weighing of evidence or any hypothesis as to what ' really happened,' but on the intrinsic quality of the event, the presence or absence of the holiness which is God Himself.

Recent Foreign Theology.

Professor J. Lindblom, Rector Magnificus of the University of Lund, has recently published an important study of the Composition of the Book of Job.[1] In 1940 he published a large work on the book of Job,[2] but like his earlier great work on the Prophets,[3] this was written in Swedish, and is not therefore likely to be widely accessible to foreign readers. The present monograph is written in French, and will be more widely read. It is marked by acute and careful analysis, and while its view of the origin and growth of the book has many elements in common with that of other scholars, it has some new features of its own.

Professor Lindblom thinks that the Prologue and the Epilogue are older than the dialogue, but that even these did not issue from a single hand. There was first of all an Edomite work about a righteous Job, who was smitten by disease, and who was tempted by his friends to accuse God of injustice, but who remained faithful and was finally rehabilitated. An Israelite writer then took up this work, and continued the Prologue, introducing Job's wife and family and also Satan, and substituted a fresh ending, in which Job's prayer of intercession figured. Later, another ending, based on the old Edomite ending, was appended. At a late date a Jewish author eliminated the old dialogue and substituted a new dialogue in three cycles, of which the third is now disordered, culminating in the Divine speech of chapters 38 f., and Job's submission as expressed in 40^{1-5}. In the hands of this author the rôles of Job and his friends were substantially modified. A later writer added the Elihu speeches, and a yet later hand inserted chapter 28. The poems about Behemoth and Leviathan, of quite independent origin, were still later inserted, and yet later still the brief Divine discourse contained in 40^{6-14}, to which was attached 42^{1-6}, which is without originality. To the reviewer this seems unnecessarily to increase the number of hands, and he is not persuaded that the Prologue and Epilogue are composite, or that 42^{1-6} is so worthless a section. Indeed, he finds 42^{5} to be the climax of the book in the penetration of its message. But this measure of disagreement with Lindblom's conclusions does not detract from the value of this masterly review of the problems, and of the modern literature devoted to them, by one of the greatest living Old Testament scholars in any land.

Of interesting points of detail one or two may be noted. In 16^{20} Lindblom renders 'My antagonist is my intercessor,' instead of 'My friends scorn me'; in 19^{27} he renders 'Without my skin . . . and without my flesh shall I see God,' but does not attempt further to cure the corruption in the first half. For the end of the third cycle of the dialogue he rearranges as follows: Bildad, 25, 26^{5-14}; Job, 26^{1-4}, 27^{2-10}; Zophar, 27^{13-23}.

[1] *La composition du livre de Job* (1945). Gleerups Förlag, Lund.

[2] *Boken om Job och hans lidande* (1940).

[3] *Profetismen i Israel* (1934).

Dr. J. S. Van der Ploeg was known to scholars before the war principally through his study of the Servant Songs of Deutero-Isaiah.[4] At the outbreak of the war he was on the staff of a Catholic College at Nijmegen, where he remained until expelled by the Germans in the winter of 1941–2. Then he went to Arnhem, where he had a handful of his books with him, while the rest were stored for safety in a house outside the town. But in the battle of Arnhem this house and all its contents were destroyed. With fine courage he determined to continue his scholarly work, but found many obstacles to the import of books from abroad, whence most of his tools must come. Some books from this country have been sent to him, their cost having been defrayed by a few people, both Catholic and Protestant, whose sympathy has been stirred, though nothing can ever serve to replace a scholar's library.

During the war, under the conditions of the German occupation, Dr. Van der Ploeg published one or two brief studies reflecting the widest reading, and if they give any indication of the richness of the library that has been lost, it was indeed a fine working library. In 1940 he published a review of recent literature bearing on the economic and social life of Israel in the period of the monarchy.[5] Its chief value is bibliographical, but any subsequent student working in this field will find it invaluable in this respect.

Two years later he published a study of social groupings in ancient Israel.[6] This is a brief, but careful and well-informed study of the mixed stock that went into the makings of Israel, and of the Biblical terms for the tribal and lesser divisions of Israel.

Two years later again, he published a survey of Hebrew lexicographical work during the last twenty-five years.[7] Once more he seems to have missed nothing of importance, save that there is no reference to the contributions of archaeology to Hebrew lexicography—chiefly through the Lachish letters and the Ras Shamra texts. The work of Professor G. R. Driver figures largely in this survey, and he collects examples of his method and suggestions, gathered from widely scattered publications, as well as much valuable information from the many other workers in this field. Altogether Dr. Van der Ploeg gives a most competent survey, and he will be a very learned man who can learn nothing from it.

[4] *Les chants du Serviteur de Jahvé* (1936).

[5] 'Sociale en economische vraagstukken uit de geschiedenis van Israël, Tijd der Koningen,' offprinted from *Ex Oriente Lux*, vii. (1940), pp. 391–399.

[6] 'Sociale groepeeringen in het Oude Israël,' offprinted from *Ex Oriente Lux*, viii. (1942), pp. 641–650.

[7] 'Vijf en twintig jaar hebreeuwsche lexicografie,' offprinted from *Ex Oriente Lux*, ix. (1944), pp. 89–98.

A full-scale and important Introduction to the Old Testament, written in Danish, appeared in 1941, and is only now becoming available in this country. It is by Professor Aage Bentzen, of Copenhagen, and it was published in three volumes, with pages continuously numbered.[1] The first volume follows the usual lines of such works, and discusses the books of the Old Testament successively from the point of view of unity, integrity, date and authorship. At the end of the volume the books of the Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha are also briefly treated. The second volume is a study of the various forms, or types, of literature found in the Old Testament. Increasing attention is paid to this aspect in modern study,[2] but in no other handbook of this type does it receive so much attention, and it is probable that it will be for this section of his work that Bentzen's book will be most valued. All of the varieties of poetic and prose literature preserved in the Old Testament are separately discussed, and examples brought together. The third volume deals with the Canon and with Textual Criticism. Here again the subject is usually briefly treated in similar handbooks, but in Bentzen's hands it receives proportionally fuller treatment than is usual. A satisfactory modern handbook of Old Testament textual criticism does not exist in English, though a good deal of the ground is well covered in Wheeler Robinson's 'The Bible in its Ancient and English Versions.' On the Canon, again, an up-to-date book is badly needed. But here Bentzen's treatment is relatively briefer.

On matters of Higher Criticism his views are in general of the normal critical variety. His work gives evidence of wide reading, and of sound, but independent, judgment. But the author is always careful to give his readers some knowledge of the history of criticism, and of the variety of current views. Space precludes any attempt to indicate his positions on all matters of recent discussion, but one or two samples must suffice. On the Servant of the Lord in Deutero-Isaiah he finds that neither the collective nor the individual interpretation can offer a wholly satisfying solution. He therefore favours the view that there was some fluidity in the concept, and finds a messianic element in it. He thinks Is 51^{9-16} belongs to the Servant cycle—a view the present writer is unable to share. On the book of Ezekiel, so much discussed in recent years, he favours the view that Ezekiel's disciples in the exilic period added to his work, probably on the basis of orally transmitted teaching, but that the book was completed before 516 B.C. He therefore rejects the pseudepigraphic theories, and is in closer agreement with Bertholet than with Herntrich. On the Song of Songs he rejects the Wedding Cycle theory, and also the more recent Tammuz Ritual theory, and concludes that the poems are no more than they appear to be—just love lyrics, probably not by a single author.

It is a great pity that this work is written in a language which will effectually seal it from many readers, to whom it could otherwise be very warmly commended.

H. H. Rowley.

Manchester.

[1] *Indledning til det Gamle Testamente.* Gads, Copenhagen.

[2] Particularly in Hempel's *Die althebräische Literatur* (1934).

Contributions and Comments.

Some Bits of Hebrew.

V.

Texts in Proverbs.

In Pr 12^{12} might we not punctuate חֶמֶד רֵשַׁע, giving the sense 'fondness for wrong is a trap for bad men,' *i.e.* their habit of preferring a dishonest course leads them to do so even when honesty would have been the best policy?

In Pr 13^{5}, with the commonly approved reading יביש, take the two Hiphils as strictly causative and render ורשע מביש ומחפיר 'but a rogue leaves you disappointed and abashed.' This gives real parallelism to 'an honest man hates a false word.' When דבר comes before שקר it is most naturally 'word' rather than, as most commentaries on this text demand, 'thing.'

In Pr 14^{25}, undoubtedly the information that a liar is a deceiver is not worth making a proverb out of. But רמה had quite regularly the force of disappointing one who had depended on your serving him (1 S 19^{17}, 2 S 19^{27}, La 1^{19}, and קשת רמיה); and the first hemistich need not be praise of the true witness's beneficence, it may equally be praise of his efficiency, since he stands the test of cross-examination and confrontation with the adverse testimony (18^{17}) and thus makes good the cause of him who employs him. We get a very good proverb, a warning against attempting to bolster up one's case by false testimony, if we render מציל נפשות עד אמת ויפח כזבים מרמה 'A true witness is a life-saver, but a lie-blower is a disappointment.' Probably punctuate מרמה as Piel participle with the Targum; but this may not be essential.

Oesterley on Pr 18^{19} approves Volz's suggestion to read מידע 'friend' rather than מדונים. The parallelism with אח would be still closer by reading מודעים 'kinsmen.' With either form of the

emendation, *ἰσχύει* (*i.e.* some form of עז) may fairly be cited as support for the letter ע, which is the new letter that the emendation brings into the word.

The difficulty in Pr 18[8] is in the long word במתלהמים. There are quite enough letters in this to make two words. If we were to read it as two words, the second would obviously be מים or המים. The first would then be במתל(ה). To explain this the most obvious thing would be an Arabistic use of מתל, with which we certainly could make out an intelligible proverb; but this does not seem really plausible, and we shall get a good fit with מים by assuming a form from the root תלל. This root has in Syriac the sense of moisture, and in Arabic that of sweating (first conjugation) or dripping (fourth conjugation). No metaphor can be more appropriate to the text than that of a seepage of water running down and penetrating into recesses.

In Pr 21[8], Haupt in the SBOT feels that a word has fallen out after איש, but does not undertake to say what word. When we are to assume something fallen out, whether a single word or a lengthy lacuna, the first presumption is always homœoteleuton. (On this basis, where we assume a lengthy lacuna of unknown tenor, we can often conjecture plausibly what its first or last word or even words may have been.) On this basis a word fallen out after איש is automatically to be conjectured מבאיש (or other Hiphil form from that root) in any case where it makes satisfactory sense; and the sense here will be quite satisfactory. The assumption Haupt seems to make, that the word did not drop out until the dittography of the following word put it under pressure, is unnecessary. הפכפך דרך איש מבאיש וזך ישר פעלו is a reasonable conjecture.

STEVEN T. BYINGTON.

Ballard Vale, Mass., U.S.A.

In Matthew vii. 25 is *προσέπεσαν* a Primitive Error displacing *προσέκοψαν*?

LACHMANN'S conjecture *προσέπαισαν* is recorded in Erwin Nestle's *Greek New Testament* (1932), bearing witness to Lachmann's dissatisfaction with the reading of the MSS. Under *προσπαίω* in *The Vocabulary of the Greek Testament* by Moulton and Milligan the assertion is made that 'it is difficult to find any good parallel for the meaning "fell upon," "struck against," which *προσέπεσαν* requires in Matt 7[25].' But it is not easy to accept *προσέπαισαν* as first aorist of *προσπαίω*, a word extremely rare, if existing at all, in Greek literature.

In this passage we have the parallel clause in *v.*[27] to indicate a more probable solution. It runs, *καὶ κατέβη ἡ βροχὴ καὶ ἦλθον οἱ ποταμοὶ καὶ ἔπνευσαν οἱ ἄνεμοι, καὶ προσέκοψαν τῇ οἰκίᾳ ἐκείνῃ, καὶ ἔπεσε.* Here the wording of *v.*[25] is exactly reproduced except that for *προσέπεσαν* we have *προσέκοψαν* and, of course, *ἔπεσε* for *οὐκ ἔπεσε*. The majority of translators seem to agree in ignoring the difference of words and in rendering the two words exactly alike, namely, in the sense of *προσέκοψαν*.

The Latin Vulgate (followed by the Rheims version), the Peshitta, Luther's *German Bible*, in English Tyndale, Cranmer, Geneva, Authorized, John Wesley's version, Moffatt, Weymouth, the recent *Book of Books*, and *The New Testament in Basic English*, all agree in rendering the two words alike, as if there was no difference in the original. Ostervald's French New Testament and the British and Foreign Bible Society's Modern Greek (which has *προσέβαλον* in both clauses) make no difference. On the other hand a few MSS of the Old Latin, Beza's Latin version, Delitzsch's Hebrew New Testament, in English Wiclif, the Revised Version (1881), the Twentieth Century New Testament, Ferrar Fenton and the English version made in Australia, have different words.

It would seem that for the most part translators have felt that the rhetorical force of the passage is strengthened by maintaining the same flow of words in the two clauses, so that *οὐκ ἔπεσε* and *ἔπεσε* in each case stand out in most effective contrast.

If these translators have obeyed a true instinct in ignoring the difference of words presented by the existing text of the original Greek, it is surely probable that an error has crept into that text and that *προσέκοψαν* ought to be read in both clauses.

But how are we to account for the existing text? The present writer suggests that the same sort of *lapsus mentis* has beset the scribe as probably happened in the case of 1 P 2[17], for which the reader is referred to THE EXPOSITORY TIMES, liv. 193 (April 1943). After he had written *προς* the mind of the scribe wandered in anticipation to *ἔπεσε*, and he inadvertently wrote *επεσαν* instead of *εκοψαν*. When he came to the parallel clause in *v.*[27], he wrote correctly *εκοψαν*, the word which he should have written in both clauses. No correction was ever made, and more accurate MSS have all perished! This may seem incredible, till we remember that there are other passages in the New Testament where primitive error affecting all extant MSS. is admitted by good scholarship to be probable.

Similar lapses may be found in English books. A rather glaring one appears in Sanday's *The Criticism of the Fourth Gospel*, p. 5, line 3, where 'power' is printed instead of 'part.'[1] The sentence runs thus: 'I cannot but believe that there is a real presumption that the Christian faith, which has played so vast a power [sic] in what appear to be the designs of the Power that rules the world is not based upon a series of deceptions.'

JAMES P. WILSON.

Edinburgh.

[1] This is corrected in a later edition.

Entre Nous.

Preaching.

The United States is still a young nation, with little history and not much literature. And so they have to make the most of what there is. Hence a type of not infrequent book, curiously like the local paper of a trivial town, in which matters of no interest to any but the immediate neighbours are chronicled in intimate detail, and people, who would never be noticed in a city, are treated as big and important. Against the background of the size of the country and the place it holds in the world, this has an odd effect. Miss Babette May Levy has written a book on *Preaching in the First Half Century of New England History* (American Society of Church History, Hartford: $5.00). She has carried through her enterprise with immense diligence, and a thoroughness such that, if this was to be done, it has been done, and need never be done over again. For one thing, she has studied with care hundreds and hundreds of ancient sermons—a heroic feat! For we preachers are made to feel even by our contemporaries that they find us a boring lot! Once, shut into a railway compartment for four stricken hours with six farmers, my mind leapt across the centuries to that wearied soul in the Apocrypha, who summed up his country neighbours with a sigh in one devastating phrase: 'Their talk is of bullocks.' So people seem to feel of us. 'Dull,' says Bagehot, 'if we must be dull, cannot we be dull in silence? Do not sermons exist? And are they not a warning to mankind?' But these sermons are three hundred years in age; and no form of literature gets quicker outmoded and old-fashioned. Yet Miss Levy emerges with the cheering verdict that she has found them more interesting than people would believe. One is glad to hear that. For the suggestions and quotations she gives us from them are not thrilling. There were big men among these preachers. All of the first generation of them belonged to the breed of Abraham; and, down to the smallest of them, had gone out, not knowing whither they went, for freedom's sake. Three or four had had a place for scholarship at Cambridge. There was Thomas Shepard, whom Jonathan Edwards so much admired; and whose 'Ten Virgins' had a place on the bookshelf in many a Scottish cottage home till eighty years ago. And there was Hooker, one of whose sermons is held to be the well head from which has flowed the American conception of democracy—a mighty stream indeed. And it took its rise in that hour or so of preaching. And there were other notable men. Sometimes one wonders if Miss Levy quite does them justice. She is a likeable soul, genial, fair-minded, industrious, with a shrewd and effective stroke of humour. But she sounds cool and detached, never much moved by these preachers' theme and message, never carried away by it, but merely appraising calmly, how it was stated. And, indeed, some of the book is beaten thin to the limit of tenuity. One long chapter tells us that these preachers used metaphors, sometimes of rivers, and sometimes of the sea, and sometimes of kings, and sometimes even of family life, as if all preachers everywhere have not so done—the very touch of the local paper! It is a pity that the last chapter comes at the end. For it is by far the most human and interesting. When the Rev. John Cotton was told by a rude parishioner after a service 'that his ministry had become generally either dark or flat, that meek man very mildly and gravely made only this answer, "Both, brother, it may be, both. Let me have your prayers that it may be otherwise."' There out of the dark that has engulfed him, a real man really rises up before us, and we see him. Or, better still, 'Whiting, whose sermons usually lasted an hour and a half followed by a half-hour of prayer, apparently found his audience frequently drifting away from him to the pleasanter land of slumber. He is reported as on one occasion interrupting his sermon to reach for his hat, he then went to feed his fowls, after remarking that he would be back when his congregation had finished sleeping.' And once, 'though this story is scarcely believable, no matter how hard pressed the good man may have been, Whiting wished for the Episcopal service so that the frequent rising would keep his listeners somewhat awake'—a delightful tale which made me read through the book again for glimpses of this whimsical and original soul.

The main results of this close study of these preachers seem to be these—that the often repeated assertion of the undue place given to terror and hell fire in their sermons has no foundation: that the social gospel was by no means omitted, since they preached with passion on economic, and even political, themes as well as upon personal salvation—almost too much: that man is a queer beast: these people who had dared all for liberty refused it bluntly to others, so that their treatment of the Quakers was as repulsive as that meted out to themselves in England: and, lastly, to encourage us, surrounded by voices deriding us and our horrid declensions, that that wail was being sounded no less confidently in these brave days of old to which we admiringly look back, with the note growing ever more lugubrious; so that, either their own prophets must be utterly discredited, or the United States must be by now a selfish lot indeed!

A. J. Gossip.

Forgiving our Enemies.

'Over-simplification of words is a major peril in religion. A great soul uses a great word in a great

sense, and then we lesser folk pick up the word, thin it out, water it down, sentimentalize it, until while we say verbally what the great soul said, we are not meaning what he meant. Nowhere is that process more evident than in our popular use of the word "forgiveness." We commonly talk as though forgiveness were a one-way street on which a gracious spirit moves out, carrying pardon to all and sundry no matter what they have done or what their attitude now is, whereas everywhere in the New Testament forgiveness is a two-way street on which penitence must move to meet the pardoning spirit before forgiveness can be consummated. . . .

'We commonly say that Jesus on the Cross forgave His murderers, but that is inaccurate. He did not forgive them; He prayed that God would: "Father, forgive them; for they know not what they do." That means, of course, that Jesus Himself was willing to forgive, but even He could not escape the moral law. . . .

'Nevertheless, at this point someone may be saying, So! the preacher in the name of Christ is backing up the wartime passions that roil the souls of the populace, but is there nothing to distinguish a Christian attitude from these common moods? Anyone can be resentful to-day, angrily calling for retribution—who here does not naturally feel that way?—but surely there is something else, specifically Christian, that should characterize the disciples of Jesus. . . .

'To Jesus the ultimate, long-range objective was always, not the punishment of the evildoer; but his redemption. Jesus never doubted the necessity of punishment for men and nations, and, child of the Hebrew prophets as He was, some of the most tremendous statements ever made about retribution came from His lips. But never did His thought stop there; always His long-range objective was the redemption of the sinner.

'Can we Christians now supply this element in our present situation?'[1]

Conditions in Germany.

The Archbishop of Canterbury, Dr. Fisher, speaking in December in the House of Lords on conditions in Germany said: 'Behind the feeding problem is the moral problem. Is it any concern of ours whether Germans starve and freeze this winter or not? A speaker in another place on this topic said:

'"I do not care two rows of pins what happens to the German people, men, women and children, from a sentimental point of view."

'There were cries of "Shame" from those who did care from a sentimental point of view; but it is not really a question of sentiment on one side or the other. It is a question of divine law and of Christian principle, whatever you think or feel about it.

'It is the bounden duty of this nation and other nations to do all that is in their power to avert this doom from the millions of Germans. And, being a divine law, obedience to it is in many ways—all kinds of ways—beneficial, though benefit is not the reason for obeying it. . . .

'If in our zone they get from this nation an effective and a practical Christianity—food for the physical hunger and a faith in life to meet their spiritual hunger—we shall have done a thing creative of hope in Germany, and, therefore, in Europe as a whole—a positive good to set against the atomic bomb and all the other destructive things in life. Therefore, it is not on sentiment, but on principle, that we must act.

'But act how? My own request to the Government is that they shall undertake to publish monthly statements on conditions in Germany in our zone, giving, as they know them and as they change, the facts, the number of people for whom we are responsible, the actual provision of food per person, the food standards in the towns, the mortality rates, the conditions of health, of shelter and of clothing, as well as industrial information such as production, unemployment, and so forth.'

Bishop Berggrav.

Bishop Berggrav of Oslo, Primate of Norway, spent a short time in London in November. *The Christian News-Letter* for 26th December 1945 quotes from a conversation which he had.

'During the occupation although the hardships were severe, you could look into the eyes of a stranger and know that you had a friend. Danger has now been removed and a feeling of depression has largely taken its place. When you find most of the world to which you were accustomed in ruins about your ears, the only thing to do is to begin again at the simple personal level, trying every day to set somebody on his feet and help him on his way. Never were the words of Jesus more to the point than they are to-day for Christians everywhere. "Work while it is yet day, for the night cometh when no man can work." We are living again in an apocalyptic age. But for Christians the overwhelming fact is not the atomic bomb or the possible disappearance of civilization, but that GOD IS, and the eternal values which are in Him can never be destroyed.'

---

[1] H. E. Fosdick, in *The Christian World*, November 29, 1945.

Printed in Scotland by MORRISON & GIBB LIMITED, Tanfield Works, and Published by T. & T. CLARK, 38 George Street, Edinburgh. It is requested that all literary communications be addressed to THE EDITOR, King's Gate, Aberdeen, Scotland.